

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1881.

The Week.

SOME of our contemporaries have indulged in profound speculations about the motives which induced Mr. Conkling to stay away from the Republican State Convention. The very natural explanation, that he stayed away because he knew a large majority of the Convention to be against him, is rejected as not deep and mysterious enough. There are dark hints of some particularly grave and far-reaching reasons of state, which only the distant future will disclose. Not being given to an habitually awestruck state of mind, and believing that a certain class of motives is common to most men, we still think that when Mr. Conkling attended personally to the primary election in his ward in Utica, and "shook hands with everybody," and when he made his friends "bolt" for him from the District Convention to appoint him as a delegate, he meant to attend the Convention personally, expecting to have a majority there in his favor; and that when he found himself in an unexpectedly small minority, he thought he had better stay away. Nobody will deny that this was a sensible conclusion. He has now gone to Washington to attend upon President Arthur, where he expects to be in a majority again. Perhaps the reorganization of the Cabinet may now be taken up. One of his friends is reported to have said yesterday that in the new arrangements Mr. Conkling will not be seen, but he "will be felt." This seems to us impossible. President Arthur may, perhaps, permit Mr. Conkling to make himself felt, but he certainly cannot be felt without being seen.

As Senator Mahone has become the financial guide of the colored voters in Virginia, the doctrine he produced before the members of the Union League Club last week deserves the serious attention of Republicans as a specimen of his teaching. Hardly anything more mischievous or misleading in the way of financial instruction could be communicated to a body of simple-minded and ignorant voters than the assertion that the rate of interest paid by a state on its loans is regulated by its resources, or, in other words, that the poorer a country is the lower the interest it has to pay, and that therefore it has only to talk poor to justify "scaling" and repudiation. It seems hardly possible that Mr. Mahone does not know that the richer a country is the higher its credit—supposing its honesty to be unimpeachable—and the better the terms on which it can borrow; the poorer it is, or pretends to be, the higher the rate of interest it has to pay. We are bound to presume, however, that when he said that this had been the experience of England, France, and Russia he was expressing his honest belief, and that he really thought that England, for instance, being very rich, paid ten or twelve per cent. on its debt, while Mexico, being very poor, paid only two or three. But

one who holds such beliefs is hardly a person whom Northern business men can afford to send back to Southern communities endorsed and approved as a trustworthy financial authority. Here at the North we should consider any State in a bad way in which a majority of the voters were under the control of anybody holding Mr. Mahone's peculiar views of the conditions of public credit. We have been fighting for fifteen years, and sometimes very hard, to protect Northern States against any such calamity, although none of them offers nearly such promising material to crazy financiers as Virginia and other Southern States do. We have no right, then, to help to inflict it on any Southern State.

The autobiography of Guiteau published by the *Herald* has no value except from the light that it throws upon his defence in his coming trial. His counsel has announced that he will only rely on the insanity of his client, and we find accordingly that the autobiography makes the killing of the President to have been pretty clearly the result of homicidal mania. There seemed in the first accounts of the crime to be the suggestion of a motive in the failure of Guiteau to get an office; but he now declares that at the very time he shot the President he was applying for the Paris consulship, and, of course, this would have furnished a motive in the opposite direction. He killed the President, he says, because "the idea flashed through my brain that if the President was out of the way, everything would go better. At first this was a mere impression. It startled me, but the next morning it came to me with renewed force, and I began to read the papers with my eye on the possibility that the President would have to go, and the more I read, the more I saw the complication of public affairs, the more I was impressed with the necessity of removing him. This thing continued for about two weeks. I kept reading the papers and kept being impressed, and the idea kept bearing and bearing and bearing down upon me that the only way to unite the two factions of the Republican party, and save the Republic from going into the hands of the rebels and Democrats, was to quietly remove the President."

The French steamer *Canada*, having on board the party of French visitors who are to be the guests of the country during the Yorktown celebration, arrived on the 5th instant, and were met on landing by the Seventh Regiment and escorted to the Fifth Avenue Hotel. The names of many of the civilians who have come over are very familiar to Americans. The Marquis de Lafayette is represented by a number of descendants. The Vicomte de Noailles is the great-grandson of the De Noailles who came to this country with Rochambeau with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, and was commissioner of the French army at the surrender of Yorktown. Curiously enough, the Marquis de Rochambeau who comes to the Yorktown celebration is said to have none of the blood of the original Rochambeau in

his veins, as he is an adopted son of a descendant of his. The Comte de Grasse is a grand-nephew of the De Grasse whose name is connected with the French Alliance and the Revolution, and also with the history of several well-known New York families. The Government delegates have of course no connection, except an official one, with Yorktown, but they are very numerous, and represent all branches of the French service. During the afternoon many of the visitors had an opportunity of seeing some of the most distinguished "Stalwarts" and "Half-breeds" at the Fifth Avenue Hotel and in the Convention; but owing to the spirit of harmony, and even tameness, which prevailed, the spectacle was not so startling as it would have been had they been engaged in active warfare. It was, in fact, the old story of the orderly working of American institutions with which our visitors have been familiar from their cradles.

The military reception of the French visitors on Thursday was very successful. The weather was fine, and there were over five thousand men in line, including all the crack militia regiments. The marching was unusually good, and the French officers were much pleased with the spectacle. In the evening General Boulanger sent a despatch to the French Minister of War praising "the citizen soldiers of the United States," evidently regarding the Seventh and Twenty-second regiments as ordinary products of the militia system, which is perhaps fortunate for us. Few of the visitors speak English easily, and as the reporters generally labor under the same difficulty with regard to French, the opportunity afforded by the visit for "interviews" is almost entirely wasted. It is really a splendid field, and it is impossible not to feel a pang of regret when we think what enterprise might accomplish in it if this obstacle were only removed. The public would greatly like to know not only all about the visitors' "home life" in France, but what are their impressions about this country—hotel life in New York, Pullman palace cars and the "check" system, the unwillingness of our citizens to attend "primaries," "Bosses" and "Halls," the search for Stewart's bones, &c., &c. On the other hand, the visitors may congratulate themselves that the difference of language shields them from what they, with their European notions, might possibly regard as impertinent curiosity and an intolerable bore.

It is reported that Mr. Dudley, Commissioner of Pensions, is on the track of a "ring" consisting of clerks in the Pension Office and outsiders, organized for the purpose of putting through fraudulent pension claims and thus robbing the Government. There would be nothing surprising in this discovery. Similar combinations were discovered and the guilty parties punished under Mr. Bentley's energetic administration of the Pension Office, but they will reorganize and be discovered again and again as long as the present laws governing the

examination of pension claims stand upon the statute book. It is almost incredible, but strictly true, that pension claims are now legally adjudicated upon mere ex-parte evidence. This is a direct invitation to fraud, and that invitation has been very extensively accepted. The most watchful man at the head of the Pension Office could not, with the most unrelenting exertions, protect the Treasury, for the ex-parte system gives so great an advantage to the fraudulent claimant that the discovery of such practices is in most cases a matter of accident. That there were millions paid for pensions fraudulently obtained has not only been admitted for many years past, but those in charge of the Pension service lost no opportunity to inform members of Congress of their experiences and opinions on that subject. Time and again during the last four years Commissioner Bentley, supported by the Secretary of the Interior, pointed out to Congress the fatal defect in the law, and urgently recommended the substitution for the ex-parte system of substantiating pension claims one permitting a thorough enquiry by the Government and the cross-examination of claimants and witnesses. But instead of acting upon these recommendations, Congress passed the act granting to pensioners arrears of pensions covering the time from the date of their application back to the period of the war. Not only did this act take uncounted millions out of the Treasury, but by offering a greater prize and multiplied opportunities to rascality it increased the abuses springing from the defective laws a hundred-fold.

The Wolfe movement in Pennsylvania is beginning to assume proportions that alarm the managers of the Machine. The Council of the National Republican League of Philadelphia has issued an address calling upon Republican voters to support Mr. Wolfe, in which the danger from the "boss" system—not only to Pennsylvania but to the whole country—is very clearly stated. The address points out that for years the control of parties has fallen more and more into the hands of "bosses"; that the larger cities are almost all in the hands of some one or more of them; that many State Governments are run by them, and the national Government is in constant danger from them. The success of the system means "the virtual overthrow of our free institutions by placing all the powers of government in the hands of a few able and unprincipled men, whose methods would permit them to transfer the authority thus acquired to a practically unlimited line of successors." Mr. Wolfe has long been a fearless enemy of the system in Pennsylvania, and though he cannot, perhaps, hope to be elected, he may, if a substantial support be given him, succeed in defeating General Bailey. His success would go far in accomplishing in Pennsylvania, by determined action outside of the regular party organization, what has in great part been accomplished here by an energetic effort of the anti-Machine sentiment in the Republican party. Whether the same result could have been achieved in Pennsylvania in the same way, we do not know. That it must be done in some way is certain, and Mr.

Wolfe, who enjoys in a rare degree the personal respect and confidence of friend and foe, is probably the best man to rally the anti-Machine forces for a decisive effort in that State.

During the week the Bank of England advanced its posted discount rate to 5 per cent. from 4 per cent., the rise having been caused by the shipment of specie to Egypt and the decline here in the rates of exchange to the point which warrants the shipment of gold from London to New York. Only a small amount of specie came here (\$704,900), and the total imports since August 1 are only \$17,004,318 against \$31,571,728 in the corresponding time a year ago. Nor have fresh shipments of any amount been made from London since the Bank rate there became 5 per cent. The disbursements of the Sub-Treasury at New York during the week covered by the bank statement exceeded the receipts by the sum of \$3,662,195, and yet the banks lost \$577,250 in their reserve, so that they lack \$3,333,275 of holding a 25 per cent. reserve. The main reason for the reduction in the reserve was the heavy shipment of currency to the West; the speculation in grain at Chicago received a severe check, and prices declined so that a good deal of money was sent from here to strengthen margins at Chicago, in addition to the usual amount required by Western trade at this season. In this condition of the money market, speculators for lower prices of stocks here "manipulated" the rates for loans so that on some days as high as $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent. per day was paid in addition to 6 per cent. per annum. The stringency in the loan market was so severe that, as is usual at such times, the Treasury was implored to "grant relief." It had already been buying \$2,000,000 of bonds per week, and it was asked to increase its purchases. This it refused to do, but agreed to begin on October 17 the prepayment, with rebate, of \$5,000,000 out of the \$20,000,000 bonds called for redemption December 24 next. This as a relief measure was not up to the expectations of Wall street, and failed to have any influence in advancing the prices of stocks. In the markets United States bonds declined $\frac{1}{2}$ @ $\frac{1}{2}$, and the 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cents at one time sold below par. Railroad investments fell $\frac{1}{2}$ @ $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and railroad stocks 2@12 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. There is as yet no sign of an early settlement of the railroad war. General trade continues active.

The woman-suffragists held a meeting last week in this city which a Dutch lady enlivened by some new arguments, and by some new applications of the old *ab uno disce omnes* argument. She held that if Senator Mahone, who only weighed ninety pounds, could bear arms and serve in the wars with credit, so could any person of the same or greater weight. Women weigh in most cases ninety pounds or over, and therefore could achieve the fame which General Mahone has achieved. This leaves out of account, however, completely the part played by the heart in a military career. A woman's fighting weight would surely be regulated as a man's really is by the

condition of her nerves. "Ordinarily," said a valiant Hoosier, "I weigh one hundred and twenty pounds; but when I'm mad I weigh a ton." So it would undoubtedly be with woman if she undertook to serve as a soldier. When her blood was up, the minutest woman would weigh as much as three Mahones in time of peace. But women of ninety pounds without Mahone's pluck would simply encumber the battle-field. Mrs. Iliohan, the Dutch lady in question, if this be her name, also derived political comfort for women from the fact that men frequently cheat in counting ballots. She predicted that women would not cheat in this way, and as there is no refuting a prophet, she had it all her own way on this point. She also knew of an Albany man who would not let his wife vote at a school election, and then sold his own vote for two dollars. The force of this anecdote seems to lie in the suggestion that man being capable of such conduct as this, the admission of woman to the franchise could not make the world worse than it is. This has a painful resemblance, however, to General Grant's argument against competitive examination—that he knew a man who after passing a very brilliant examination got into the penitentiary. We can assure Mrs. Iliohan, as an answer to this, that we have known scores of men who, while discouraging their wives from voting, refused to sell their own votes, or who, having sold them, used the money in presents for the children. Then, too, in judging a man for selling his vote, we must take his necessities into account. There are probably many cases like that of the poor member of the old Irish Parliament, who, on being reproached at the time of the Union with having "sold his country," so great were his needs, "thanked God that he had a country to sell." Such cases, whatever one may feel about the value of political purity, cannot but excite commiseration.

The Court of Appeals has at length decided that the prohibition of the courts of this State against the guilty party in a divorce proceeding marrying again has no force outside the State, and that marriages of persons divorced here, who go elsewhere to evade the prohibition, are valid in New York. The argument which probably affected the minds of the judges most was drawn from the inconvenient results which would follow from holding anything else. In theory it seems a preposterous state of the law which visits a man with a heavy penalty for marrying in New York, and at the same time informs him that if he will take the trouble to cross the Connecticut State line he can marry there and immediately bring his wife to live with him in New York without any danger from the penalty. But on the other hand the marriage is perfectly good in Connecticut, and the general principle is that a marriage good in one place is good all over the world. With the facilities which exist in this country for procuring divorces, it is perhaps better to have marriages of whatever kind recognized as valid, as the alternative is the bastardizing of children, who certainly ought not to be made to suffer for the laxity of their parents' views on the subject of marriage and divorce. The only

remedy for the present condition of affairs is a uniform law, which is not possible except under a Constitutional amendment, or the introduction of some uniform practice throughout the States by voluntary agreement. The chief obstacle in the way of this is the lack of interest which those chiefly affected, *i. e.*, those who take advantage of the existing chaotic condition of the law, naturally feel in the subject. All they want is to be let alone.

Coudert Brothers have written a letter to the *Evening Post* with regard to the Esposito scandal, in which they insist that the original warrant was perfectly legal, meaning by this that there was nothing illegal in arresting the man in New Orleans on a New York Commissioner's warrant. They say nothing with regard to the execution of the warrant by a private detective, as they had nothing to do with the case at that stage. After he had been committed in New York, he was of course in the Marshal's legal custody, though his capture in New Orleans may have been entirely illegal. Nor does anything they say affect the propriety of trying the question of the man's identity fourteen hundred miles away from his place of residence. The Heinrichs case merely held that the prisoner might legally be brought from Wisconsin to New York. There was no question of identity in it. In the Esposito case, the prisoner's counsel had, we believe, some twenty-five affidavits of residents of New Orleans that the prisoner had been living there at the time of the commission of the alleged crimes, and all this evidence was ruled out because the witnesses could not be produced in court. With the final proceedings by which the prisoner was got out of the country, the Messrs. Coudert had nothing to do, and therefore their opinion on the subject is entitled only to the weight that would be due to that of any other intelligent lawyers conversant with the facts. The whole matter ought to be carefully sifted by the State Department.

We are informed by Atlantic cable that at the Socialist Congress assembled at Chur, in Switzerland, "the American delegate gave a desponding account of the condition of Socialism in America." He said that "the number of Socialist newspapers there had been reduced by one-half since 1877, and that the better times had caused a thinning of their ranks." This reminds us of the reply given by a prominent Communist leader who visited America thirty years ago to the question what he thought of the condition of the working classes here. "It is very bad," said he, "they are so discouragingly prosperous."

Mr. Gladstone has made at last the first one of those speeches which every English politician of prominence is expected to make to his constituents in the recess, giving his general view of the political situation. It is very seldom that a session passes in which Ministers are so far prevented from freeing their minds on all the problems of the day as they have been during that which has just closed, so completely was their attention and that of

the House engrossed in the passage of the Irish Land Bill. It is very seldom, indeed, that half a year passes with so few great debates on a variety of questions. This has been probably due to the intellectual weakness of the Opposition in the Commons, but in a still greater degree to the absolute necessity of devoting every available minute to pushing the Irish legislation. It is none the less true, however, that Mr. Gladstone's reputation, great as it was at the beginning, has grown during the session. Opposition newspapers unite with the Liberal in admiring not simply the extraordinary vigor and readiness which he displayed in piloting the Land Bill—with these qualities of his the public had long been familiar—but the extraordinary tact and patience he displayed—for these were qualities which even his friends in time past have not ventured to claim for him. In fact a certain heat and irritability of temper, a tendency to be indignant over folly and absurdity, for which he has hitherto been somewhat noted, seems to be leaving him in his old age, and to be succeeded by a sort of jocular serenity which makes it impossible any longer for the young men of the Carlton Club to have the fun, to which they used formerly to treat themselves, of going down to the House in the evening full of wine, and "drawing" him.

In his speech at Leeds, where he was almost overwhelmed by the cordiality of his welcome, he gave the key to the Liberal foreign policy by saying that it was based on the presumption that the motives of all foreign powers were good, until the contrary was shown, in this differing from the Tory policy, which always assumes the existence of one foreign villain. This villain used to be France; it is now Russia. But Mr. Gladstone's statement would have been more correct if he had confined it to Christian powers. His Government does not and cannot deal with Turkey on the assumption that she means well. The policy of the great Powers towards her is now and has been for fifty years based on the theory that she means ill, and will only behave decently under threats and watching. On the Irish question he was very strong in his eulogies of those Irish nationalists, like Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, and even Mr. John Dillon, who, while regretting the English connection in its present shape, accept the Land Act as a boon for the peasantry. He was equally strong in his denunciations of Parnell, whose mingled ferocity, duplicity, and tergiversation certainly make him fair game for any amount of vituperation. But Mr. Gladstone nevertheless did not touch the root of the Irish difficulty. If his compliments to Sir Charles Duffy were deserved, and Sir Charles's good word may do much to make the Land Act acceptable, then Sir Charles, or some Irishman like him, ought to be in the Irish Secretaryship. There ought, in short, to be an Irish department in the Government from which "healing measures" would come as native legislation, and not as a "boon" from Englishmen, like Mr. Forster, or for that matter Mr. Gladstone himself, who, however estimable, have as rulers the capital defect of being strangers, and unsympathetic strangers.

The British troubles with the Boers of South Africa are apparently not over. The convention under which peace was concluded with Paul Kruger and his two colleagues, popularly known as "the Triumvirate," had to be submitted to the Transvaal Parliament, or Volksraad, for ratification, and the news now is that the ratification is likely to be refused, on the general ground that the convention reserves too much power to the British Government. It establishes religious liberty, which the Boers, like our early Puritans, appreciate highly for themselves, but do not think suitable for other denominations than their own. They are, in fact, now almost the only real Old Testament Christians left in the world. They are not prepared to surrender all foreign relations, as the convention requires them to do. They are willing to have their foreign relations controlled, but not conducted, by the Queen's Government. Nor are they willing to have the natives assured equal standing in the courts with the Dutch and protected against all exceptional legislation. These objections seem to be partly practical and partly sentimental. The natives by whom the Dutch are surrounded outnumber them greatly, and are in a state of almost complete savagery. To treat them as equals, and relinquish all control of them, is something of which the Dutch have a traditional dread. It was to avoid it that they emigrated from the Cape Colony into the wilderness fifty years ago. In fact they contemplate it very much with the feelings with which the Southerners contemplated negro equality in 1860. Unfortunately, however, they do not possess the adaptability to circumstances and the readiness to accept the inevitable, when once clearly recognized, which delivers Americans out of so many dismal situations. The Boers are emphatically a stiff-necked people. They are real Bourbons, and they believe they have the Almighty at their back.

The resistance of the Volksraad is, however, in all probability largely due to the opinion of their own military prowess which the country Boers have derived from the late contest. The triumvirs who made the convention are men of some education, who have travelled in Europe and know the resources of the British Government. The farmers from the interior, however, are satisfied, like our Indians on the plains, that they had before them in the late contest the whole British power, and that in the three fights in which they defeated Sir George Colley, England was doing her "level best." They think, therefore, they let her off too easy, or rather conceded too much, and that if they hold out she will abate some of her pretensions. There is much reason to fear that this ignorance may hurry the Volksraad into a renewal of the contest. Accordingly the withdrawal of the British troops has been stopped, and if the convention has not been ratified by the 9th of November, the war will begin again. This time, however, the Boers will have few or no friends in England, and even their Dutch cousins will find it difficult to lift up their voices for them after having thanked the Gladstone Ministry for the liberality of its dealings with them.

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS
DOMESTIC.

THE Senate met in extra session on Monday. Owing to the resignation of the two Senators from New York, and the death of Senator Burnside of Rhode Island, the Democrats had a majority. Senator Edmunds, who was spokesman for the Republicans, moved that the new Senators from the above-mentioned States be sworn in before proceeding to the election of a President *pro tem*. This was lost by a strict party vote, and, after an ineffectual struggle on the part of the Republicans, Senator Bayard, of Delaware, was elected President *pro tem*. The Senate then adjourned.

Senators Miller, Lapham, and Nelson W. Aldrich, the newly chosen successor of the late General Burnside from Rhode Island, were sworn in immediately upon the assembling of the Senate on Tuesday.

President Arthur intends to send to the Senate for confirmation the names of nearly all the persons nominated by President Garfield after the Senate adjourned.

It is tolerably certain that two Cabinet changes will be announced when the Senate meets on Thursday, the retiring members being Secretary Windom and Attorney-General MacVeagh.

Secretary Blaine has denied the report that he ever made any efforts to remain in the Cabinet.

Mr. Blaine's letter to President Garfield accepting the Secretaryship of State has been published. It concludes, "However much, my dear Garfield, I might admire you as a statesman, I would not enter your Cabinet if I did not believe in you as a man and love you as a friend."

Mr. Edgerton, who was appointed by the Governor of Minnesota to succeed Mr. Windom in the Senate, will not press his claim on the Legislature. The Legislature will begin to ballot for Senator on the 18th instant, and Mr. Windom's election is regarded as certain.

The United States Supreme Court met on Tuesday. Chief-Justice Waite and Associate-Justices Miller, Bradley, Harlan, Woods, and Matthews were present, and subsequently waited upon the President.

Guiteau has made a long statement to the Washington correspondent of the New York Herald, in which he gives the history of his life from his birth to the day on which he shot the President. He says he watched for an opportunity to shoot President Garfield from May 18 to July 2. In conclusion, Guiteau reviews the legal aspects of his case in a clear and deliberate way, which shows that as a lawyer, at least, he is perfectly sane.

The indictment against Guiteau was presented to the Grand Jury on Saturday morning at eleven o'clock. At a quarter before one P. M. "a true bill" was found. The indictment embraces eleven counts.

A copy of the indictment and a list of the witnesses for the prosecution have been read to Guiteau in his cell at the jail. He will be arraigned for trial on Thursday.

Mr. Scoville, Guiteau's brother-in-law and counsel, has been trying to obtain assistant counsel. He has been unsuccessful so far. Guiteau has requested him to telegraph to General B. F. Butler and ask him to take charge of his defence.

The paper upon President Garfield's case which Dr. Bliss has been engaged in preparing, in company with Dr. Shrady of New York, has been published in the *Medical Record*.

The fund for Mrs. Garfield reached \$337,334 06 on Sunday. The Michigan Relief Fund reached a grand total of \$93,436 84 on the same day.

The executive committee appointed to devise means for building a "Garfield Memorial Hospital" in Washington met on Monday evening. General Sherman presided. Secretary Blaine and Dr. Busey were appointed

a committee to draft a national and an international appeal to carry the undertaking into immediate effect.

The New York State Republican Convention met in the Academy of Music, in New York city, on Wednesday. The Convention was called to order by ex-Senator T. C. Platt, *pro tempore* Chairman of the Republican State Committee. Senator Warner Miller and Congressman Hiscock were the candidates respectively of the "Anti-Conkling" and "Stalwart" wings for the office of temporary Chairman of the Convention. Mr. Miller was elected by a majority of 108. This was the test vote, and showed the Anti-Conklingites to be in a sufficient majority to control the proceedings of the Convention. At the evening session Mr. Chauncey Depew was made permanent chairman. The various committees then made their reports. A noteworthy feature of the report of the Committee upon Contested Seats was that the contesting delegation from the First Oneida District, headed by Mr. Conkling, was adjudged not entitled to seats. The motion to lay on the table the resolution referring the question of the reënrolment of the Republicans of New York and Kings counties to the State Committee, with power, was carried by a majority of five votes. The Convention adjourned at 1 A. M. The ticket nominated is as follows: Secretary of State, Joseph B. Carr; Controller, Ira Davenport; Attorney-General, Leslie W. Russell; Treasurer, James W. Husted; Engineer and Surveyor, Silas Seymour; Judge of Court of Appeals, Francis M. Finch. The platform deplors the death of General Garfield, declares the entire confidence of the Republicans of New York in the "ability, integrity, and patriotic intentions of Chester A. Arthur"; calls for the reduction of taxes, but adds that Congress should approach this duty "with due regard to the protection of American industry"; assures President Arthur of the hearty approval of the people in pressing the prosecution of the Star-route frauds; eulogizes the administration of Governor Cornell; favors "submitting to the people the question of making our canals practically free"; and calls for an "equitable system of taxation which will reach corporations as well as individuals."

Mr. George Bliss has addressed an ill-natured letter to the New York Times in reply to its comments on his opposing the reorganization of the Republican party in this city. He says his letter two years ago "corrected some abuses," and till within a few weeks he has known of "no new flagrant case of abuse." As many Republicans take part in the city organizations as in the country, and a larger number would not alter the present control to any great extent. He admits cases of prevention of membership, and that there is fraud in voting "at times" at the primary elections, as at State elections. But to reorganize just now would be dangerous to an already divided party. At the Convention he only wished for postponement, though it is an extreme measure to invoke the intervention of the State Convention.

The Massachusetts Democratic State Convention was held at Worcester on Wednesday. Charles P. Thompson of Gloucester and James H. Carleton of Haverhill were nominated for the offices of Governor and Lieutenant-Governor respectively. The platform declares the national debt to be a hindrance to our "commercial well-being"; calls for an "intelligently bold revision of the tariff laws," and declares that the present tariff should give place to "lighter duties more justly distributed." It further declares the intention of the Democrats, so soon as they shall obtain control of the National Administration, to simplify the civil service "from its present overgrown and corrupting proportions"; to regulate appointment to it by law; and to bring it about that "all subordinate officers shall know and feel that during their prescribed term of service they owe all to their country and nothing to party chiefs"; but that "they shall also know and feel that they cannot, any more than

Senators and Representatives, fasten themselves as a permanent life burden on the body politic."

The Minnesota Democratic State Convention met at St. Paul on Thursday. Nominations were made for all the State offices. The platform pledges the Democratic party to the payment of all obligations resting upon the State, expresses sorrow for the death of President Garfield, and reaffirms the principles of the last Democratic National Convention.

The Connecticut town elections, which took place last week, show a Republican gain over the similar elections of last year, when the Republicans carried an unusually large number of towns.

Mr. S. J. Tilden, having been importuned to use his influence in behalf of certain would-be candidates for nomination at the New York Democratic Convention, has written a letter in which he disavows any intention of controlling the Convention at Albany so as to obtain the nomination for Governor next year. He concludes by saying: "All I desire for the Democratic party in the coming canvass is that it shall make the best possible choice of candidates, and do everything to advance the principles of administration to which I have devoted so many efforts and sacrifices."

At the meeting of the Minnesota Legislature in special session on Tuesday, a strong resolution in favor of civil service reform was introduced. It demands an amendment to the Constitution to the effect that officers appointed to fill Federal offices "be no longer subject to annoyance or removal at the whim or caprice of men wielding the appointing power for personal or political ends, but each shall be vested with a Constitutional right to hold any office to which he has been appointed during good behavior, or for a time prescribed by the Constitution."

The International Cotton Exposition was opened at Atlanta, Georgia, on Wednesday. There was a large attendance and much enthusiasm was manifested. Governor Colquitt presided, and Senator Voorhees made a speech which is said to have been the "incident of the day." There will be one thousand eight hundred distinct entries and displays, which will make it the largest exposition, with the exception of the Centennial, ever seen in America.

The French gentlemen who have come to attend the Yorktown celebration arrived in New York on Wednesday. They were received by the State Reception Committee and escorted to the Fifth Avenue Hotel. Governor Cornell and his staff were presented to them in the afternoon. On Friday the United States steamers *Kearsarge* and *Tennessee* took the visitors, together with prominent officials and invited guests, to West Point. From there they went on a tour to Niagara Falls, Elmira, Baltimore, and Washington.

Under the provisions of the Act of Congress relating to the centennial celebration at Yorktown, the sum of \$20,000 was appropriated for the entertainment of the foreign guests, and an equal sum was set apart to defray the expenses of the military celebration. The latter appropriation has already been expended, and there will be a deficit of \$9,500, which Congress will be appealed to to make good.

A three days' festival incidental to the Yorktown celebration was begun at Baltimore on Monday, an incident of which was the introduction into the city of water from the new works at Gunpowder River.

Mr. Windom has issued a circular giving notice that the United States bonds embraced in the one hundred and fifth call, to the amount of \$5,000,000, will be redeemed on and after October 17.

The reports of various cotton exchanges in the Southern States announce the cotton crop to be considerably damaged by the unfavorable weather. It is estimated that there will be a decrease of about thirty-three per cent. in the yield this year.

The Iron Mountain train robbers have pleaded guilty to fourteen indictments, which makes the term of punishment seventy years for each man. The men who captured the robbers found \$9,000 in their possession. This amount they divided among themselves, promising to pay \$100 a year to the families of the robbers and to leave no means untried to secure their release from the Penitentiary after conviction, on condition that the robbers should keep the matter secret. One of the capturers, however, being troubled by his conscience, revealed the whole thing.

The counsel for the defendants in the Star-route cases have filed papers attacking the information against Brady, and a motion has been made to rescind the order allowing the filing of the information.

A statement just prepared by the Post-Office Department shows for the fiscal year ending June 30 a deficiency of \$2,786,340, a gain over the previous term of \$320,002. Postmaster-General James's savings in consequence of the Star-route overhauling are exhibited, of course, only in the last quarter, where the net gain appears to be a little more than half a million.

Nothing of importance has occurred in the Malley case during the week. The defence continues to bring forward evidence to prove an *alibi*.

There has been an unusually large amount of hazing at the Annapolis Naval Academy this year, and on Tuesday last the whole third class was put on board the *Santee*, where they remained until they signed a pledge to refrain from any further hazing. It is expected that this will have a salutary effect upon future classes.

A gold life-saving medal has been presented to Mrs. Ida Lewis Wilson for her brave conduct in rescuing two soldiers stationed at Fort Adams, near Newport, who fell through the ice in the harbor.

There was a great fire in New York on Monday night. It originated in the car stables of the Fourth Avenue road, and before it was subdued it had destroyed the greater part of the Morrell storage warehouse, situated on Fourth avenue and Thirty-second street. Much valuable property in the way of books, furniture, and pictures was stored in this building. The loss is estimated at \$2,000,000.

The Coudert Bros., counsel for the Italian Government in procuring the extradition of Esposito, have addressed a letter to the *Evening Post* in regard to the two points whether Esposito was kidnapped, and whether he was "smuggled out of the country by means of an imposition on the State Department." They say the legality of the warrant by which he was arrested "was never questioned during the trial," and was even conceded by one of his counsel. Otherwise a remedy by *habeas corpus* lay open. They deny the issuing of a second warrant for rearrest on Esposito's arrival here from New Orleans. The subsequent procedure was in the routine of the State Department, and bears no marks of haste. There was no understanding about an appeal, and there were six days in which to make one.

It is reported that Mr. Jay Gould has secured a majority of the shares of the stock of the Manhattan Elevated Railway and will control the next election.

FOREIGN.

Mr. Gladstone arrived at Leeds on Thursday, and was received with great enthusiasm. He made a speech in reply to eighty-six addresses which were presented to him, in the course of which he referred to the Fair-Trade League. He said that some persons had complained about the American tariff, and that although America sent to England only £3,000,000 worth of manufactures, while England had sent to America from £30,000,000 to £40,000,000, yet the Fair Traders wanted America to cease to be England's customers

to that amount. More unfair leaguers, he said, he never knew. He also said that he expected Sir Stafford Northcote to declare emphatically before long whether he favored protection and a corn duty, but that as for himself he would be no party to a retrograde movement. At a banquet given to Mr. Gladstone on Friday he made a speech in which he attacked Parnell, contrasting his course with that of O'Connell. He concluded by saying that Parliament was not going to overturn the principles of public right and public order to please Mr. Parnell. The London *Times* says that these "speeches of Mr. Gladstone, in the present condition of affairs, can hardly fail to be taken as an important political manifesto."

In his reply to an address from the Leeds Chamber of Commerce on Saturday, Mr. Gladstone said that although he could not make an explicit statement in regard to the negotiations for a new Anglo-French commercial treaty, they were in no way surrounded by doubt or difficulty.

It is reported as tolerably certain that the Anglo-French and Franco-Italian treaty negotiations will not be resumed until after the formation of the new French Cabinet.

The Cobden Club is calling upon its friends for a special subscription of £2,000, to be expended upon Free-Trade books and pamphlets to combat the Fair-Trade movement.

A letter has been published in the Paris *Bourse* from Sir Garnet Wolseley, in which he says he earnestly trusts the English Channel Tunnel project may never be carried out, as he feels that its construction would be a lasting source of danger to England.

Further trouble seems to be impending between England and the Boers. The Volksraad objects to a number of articles of the convention with England. The Boer Triumvirate desire that England shall merely have control of, and not conduct, foreign affairs, and shall have no right of approval of the Transvaal laws.

In an address at Wexford, on Sunday, Mr. Parnell referred to the speeches which Mr. Gladstone had been making at Leeds and elsewhere. He characterized them as unscrupulous and dishonest, and declared that Mr. Gladstone had maligned the Irish people, the bishops and Mr. Dillon.

The midland counties of Ireland are still very lawless. "Boycotting" is being carried on with unrelenting vigor, and incendiarism is frequent.

The Land Commission has issued a notice announcing that any tenant evicted since the 23d of February last has the right to ask the settlement of the judicial rent of the holding.

The first notice filed by a landlord has been sent in to the Land Commissioners by the Marquis of Waterford, asking to have the rents of two tenants increased.

A Labor Convention will assemble in Dublin at the end of October for the purpose of forming a national organization of farm laborers to act with and under the direction of the Land League. A few of the prominent leaders of the labor movement will be selected at the Convention as candidates for Parliament.

The directors of the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture have formally approved the draft of the Land Bill for Scotland. They also approved the draft of a bill for the abolition of primogeniture and entail.

Lord Lorne's Western trip has excited great interest among Scottish farmers. The London *Times* says that they have been impressed with the fact that the Canadians are opening up a country which is a promising field for occupation "by people who are still proud to call themselves British subjects."

Foxhall won the Cesarevitch stakes at the Newmarket Second October Meeting on Tuesday. The betting against Foxhall just before the start was 9 to 2.

In the Spanish Cortes on Saturday Señor

Guell presented an amendment to the reply to the address from the throne, demanding autonomy for Cuba and the conclusion of a commercial treaty between Cuba and the United States on the basis of absolute freedom of commerce.

General Prendergast has been appointed Governor of Cuba, in the place of General Blanco. He will start for Cuba on October 28.

The Kings of Spain and Portugal met at Valencia de Alcantara on Saturday, and opened the Caceres railway, by which the journey between Madrid and Lisbon is materially shortened.

The Marquis of Northcote invested King Alfonso of Spain with the British Order of the Garter on Tuesday.

The Portuguese court has gone into four days' mourning for President Garfield.

Telegrams have been received confirming the report of a massacre at Wady Zerga by the Arabs. Wady Zerga is a station on the French railway sixty miles from Tunis. The stationmaster, who was an ex-lieutenant in the French army, was burned alive and ten employees massacred. The preparations for operations against Bou-Amena are reported to have been completed. Two thousand camels have been collected at Oran for a long expedition against him in the desert.

In deference to urgent representations by M. Roustan, the French Minister, the Bey finally consented to a partial occupation of Tunis, and on Monday morning the French troops entered the city and occupied the Kasbar and two other forts.

It is reported that a secret council of Ministers has been held in Tunis, and that a scheme is proposed for the surrender of the financial administration of the country to France and the issue of a French loan of 225,000,000 francs.

The Paris *Weekly Medical Gazette* publishes communications from members of the ambulance service in Algeria complaining bitterly of the want of organization in the sanitary arrangements of the army.

The Turkish delegates to Egypt demanded a special court of enquiry into the general state of the country, but the Khedive refused his consent to any interference with Egyptian independence, and the Porte authorized the delegates to withdraw the demand. The Khedive has, however, given his consent to an informal enquiry, which is now proceeding.

Immediately upon being informed of the despatch of the Turkish mission to Egypt, Lord Granville informed France that he was willing to take the initiative in a proposal for joint action in Egypt, and suggested that an identical note be sent to the Porte explaining the perfect understanding existing between France and England, and declaring that while both nations fully recognized the Porte's right of suzerainty, they would not tolerate any manifestation likely to endanger the influence and rights enjoyed by the two powers in the financial administration of Egypt. England and France have each sent an iron-clad to Alexandria.

Negotiations for including the city of Bremen in the Zollverein will begin this week. Herr von Bitter, the Prussian Minister of Finance, has gone to Bremen to pave the way for the conclusion of the arrangement.

The Vienna Regatta Committee have written a letter to the London *Sportman* repudiating the insinuation that one of the committee was concerned in bribing Shinkel, of the Cornell crew. They declare the statements published in the New York *Tribune* of the 6th of September, and alleged to have been made by Mr. Allen, a member of the Cornell crew, to be falsehoods.

The Committee of the Mexican Congress has reported in favor of the approval of the railroad concessions granted by the President during the recess.

TUESDAY, October 11, 1881.

REPUBLICAN PROSPECTS.

THE anti-Stalwart majority which controlled the recent Republican State Convention owed its power to a popular movement against boss-rule in the management of the Republican party. The proceedings of many of the district conventions, and the resolutions passed there, leave no doubt of this fact. It was no mere contest between two factions of the party for the possession of the spoils; at least this was not the motive power with the rank and file on the anti-Machine side. Had it been so, then—as many predicted—the death of President Garfield and the accession of Mr. Arthur to the Presidency would have given the faction with which Mr. Arthur had been identified a great advantage in the election of delegates, and probably the control of the Convention. But the change in the national Administration had no visible effect upon the Republicans in this State. They remained as determined as ever to overthrow the old Conkling machine, and they sent their delegates to the State Convention for that purpose.

Taking the object to be accomplished in a narrow sense, they did what they were sent for. They took the organization of the Convention out of the hands of the Stalwarts. They defeated the attempts of the Conkling men to obtain seats in the Convention by trumped-up contests. They appointed a State Committee with an anti-Stalwart majority, and thus changed the character of the official representation of the party. They showed in a variety of ways, without mentioning any names, that the Republican party of this State very positively and firmly declines to be ruled by the Grant-Conkling combination. This was well as far as it went. But leadership of a higher order would have broadened the objects of the movement to which the majority in the Convention owed its existence. With the exception of an eloquent resolution on President Garfield's death and another one in favor of a railroad commission, which was added to the report of the committee on the motion of a delegate, the platform is scarcely above the ordinary routine standard. The resolution on civil-service reform, instead of being outspoken and specific in its propositions and demands, virtually refers the whole subject to President Arthur for his kind consideration, simply assuring him that if he sees fit to do anything in that line, the Republicans of New York will stand by him. We will not say that the committee which drew up and reported this resolution meant to trifle with the subject, but if it intended to say and do anything for a real reform of the civil service, it was singularly unfortunate in expressing its sentiments. A simple statement of the moral of President Garfield's death would have been very much more pointed and effective. Had the leaders of the majority made this Convention the starting point of a general crusade against the spoils system instead of being satisfied with the destruction of one of its excrescences, they would have made a far deeper impression upon the popular mind and imparted a living and moving interest to the campaign, the lack of which will perhaps be severely felt.

The failure of the resolution entrusting the

State Committee with the reorganization of the party in this city and Kings county is not only a lamentable thing in itself, but it puts the leaders of the majority in an almost ludicrous light. The resolution was one of those reported by the Platform Committee. A well-known member of the Machine promptly moved that its consideration be postponed until after the nomination of candidates for the State offices. The purpose of this motion must have been clear to anybody who has ever watched the proceedings of a convention. It is a well-known experience that when the main business is done the delegates become impatient to go home, and the most important things sometimes fail to arrest their attention. But nobody attempted to stop this trick of the Machine men, which was as successful as they expected. Mr. George Bliss was even permitted to put forth, without a word in reply, the astounding assertion that the increase of the Republican vote in this city at the Presidential election last autumn was owing to the efficiency of the district organizations governed by the "Mike" Cregans, the "Jake" Pattersons, and the like. However, in this way the much-needed reorganization of the Republican party in this city was defeated by a majority of five votes, the Machine men raised a shout of triumph, and the rotten boroughs will flourish a while longer, until the reform of party organization is taken in hand by committees of the most respected citizens, and until the leaders of the anti-Machine Republicans in conventions will have learned how to be vigilant and how to use the advantages of a majority. On the whole, this Convention may be looked upon as a forward step, but there is still much more to do.

That the "Stalwarts" were greatly displeased, and that some of them should have indulged in little exhibitions of a soured temper in talk and manner when the control of the Republican party had passed from their hands, is but natural. Such personal demonstrations of disappointment may continue for a little while, as they are apt to do after almost every party convention in which one set of politicians gets the better of another set. But they are not likely to continue very long or to spread very far; and if there be any Democrats who count upon deep and fierce dissensions in the Republican ranks as an element of Democratic strength, they will probably find themselves mistaken. Even if Mr. Conkling himself desired the defeat of the Republican candidates, of which there is a possibility but no evidence, his influence upon the Stalwart hosts, however large or small they may be, will now be vastly inferior to that of President Arthur, and it may be taken for granted that the latter cannot possibly desire a Republican defeat in New York this autumn. The strongest leading influences on the Stalwart side will therefore be in favor of the ticket nominated by the late Convention.

Nor is the Stalwart mind likely to be impressed by the idea that a defeat under the leadership of the anti-Stalwart Republicans would ultimately strengthen their side again. All they might hope to accomplish by such a defeat is to show that they are strong enough, by refusing their active support, to prevent the success of Republican candidates whom they dis-

like. But in this way they have nothing to gain. If they try it and fail, it will be a crushing demonstration of their own weakness. If they try it and succeed, they will lose their only political capital, which consists in party fidelity. The time is past when they might in such a way persuade the Republican party of this State that victory is possible only with Stalwart leadership, and that therefore the staff of command must be restored to them. The only effect they could produce would be to provoke retaliation, and thus cut off all their own personal hopes for the future; for if the Stalwarts are strong enough to defeat anti-Stalwart candidates, the anti-Stalwarts, with their superiority in popular strength, will certainly be able to defeat Stalwart candidates. It is, therefore, not probable that the Stalwart politicians, who are no sluggards when their own interests are involved, will now do anything to make themselves in any way responsible for a defeat of the Republican party.

But there is danger in another direction. It has been remarked that this year's campaign in Ohio is without spirit and interest; that people will not turn out to attend public meetings, and that the demonstrations attempted are tame and profitless. The same thing is observed in other States. The reason for this is not to be found only in the universal mourning for President Garfield: the people do not take any interest in the campaigns because there are no subjects under discussion which arouse the popular interest. When the question of specie payments was before the people nothing could surpass the spirit and energy of a campaign in Ohio. People would attend meetings every day in the week. So it was all over the country during the last Presidential campaign, when the relation of politics to the prosperity of the country was an absorbing theme. But there is no question of similar interest called up for discussion now, and most people are heartily tired of the old ding-dong about the infinite goodness of one party and the infinite badness of the other. When an election signifies nothing more to the mind of the ordinary citizen than the question whether Jones or Smith is to be Secretary of State, the ordinary citizen is very apt to content himself with the belief that Jones and Smith are both respectable men, and that the republic will not be imperilled by the triumph or defeat of either. The campaign in this State will be virtually in this condition, and, as experience shows, the Republicans usually suffer most from such apathy. The only public topic which has of late been engaging the popular mind and an earnest discussion of which might arouse the interest of the masses, is that of civil-service reform. But since the Republican Convention contented itself with referring that whole subject to the discretion of President Arthur, who, with all the good qualities he possesses, has so far not been known as a friend of a systematic civil-service reform, no practical issue is furnished by the party. While we might make a fit subject of discussion before the people what the President ought to do, we can scarcely argue the question what he is probably going to do so that the Republicans of New York may support him in it. It may turn out that the "practical politicians" who made the platform missed their

chance in this respect. It has not unfrequently been observed that the "doctrinaires" are, under such circumstances, apt to be more practical. But while the want or rather the throwing away of an interesting issue will be unfavorable to the Republicans, we shall not at all be surprised to see the Democrats throw away their advantages by a new, or rather a continuation of the old, quarrel among themselves.

MR. GEORGE BLISS AND REPUBLICAN REORGANIZATION.

MR. GEORGE BLISS is a person who excites a good deal of hostility, for one reason or another, but he enjoys one great advantage over his enemies in that they never know where to find him. The whereabouts of the "little joker" at the fair is not more uncertain to the innocent rustic gambler than Mr. Bliss's political position in any particular month of the year to those desirous either of acting with him or against him. Sometimes he is for reform and sometimes for things as they are, but there are no outward signs by which his exact attitude towards either reform or abuse can be ascertained at any particular moment. There are, of course, laws which govern his motions as the motions of all other created bodies, but nobody knows them but himself, and all questioning about them he resents fiercely.

The Republican party in this city was reorganized in 1871, by Mr. Jackson S. Schultz and Mr. William Orton. Mr. Bliss has since acknowledged that when this reorganization was effected in that year, Mr. Schultz said in his presence, and he concurred, "that the usefulness of the reorganization therein established would not last more than ten years, for the reason that everything degenerates in New York, and nothing so fast as political organization." Nevertheless, after it had been in operation for four years, Mr. Bliss, in a letter to the *Nation* (September 7, 1876), gave this account of the primaries:

"Since I have had any influence in such matters, I have attended no primary at which there was even an accusation of unfair dealing. In the district in which I reside, which is the only one in which I ever attended a primary, I have procured the adoption of a practice which does away with all secret or close caucuses. Every member of the association is invited to every caucus, and can make himself heard.

"No Republican has, to my knowledge, ever been refused admission to the association. From the indefiniteness of your word 'fixing,' I can only meet it by repeating that neither in primary, caucus, nor convention have I ever been concerned in anything which prevented, or was intended to prevent, the fair expression of the views and wishes of all. I have usually had my own candidates and my own opinions, and have urged the one and expressed the other freely. Sometimes I have succeeded and sometimes I have been beaten. When overruled I have concluded I was wrong, for, not being the editor of a weekly reform newspaper, I have never claimed omniscience. I may add I do not believe that Republican caucuses or primaries or conventions in this city are often 'fixed,' if by that you mean the prevention of the fair expression of opinion."

This is plain enough. He considered the system a great success, and saw no signs of the degeneration he had anticipated. Three years later—in 1879—however, he wrote another letter about it, this time to General Arthur, in which he said that of the 13,355 names on the rolls of the District Associations, nearly half were those of dead men, of men who

had removed, and of men who had turned Democrats. "Not six thousand," said he, "should be there." The rolls, too, were full of the names of avowed Democrats, kept there by the managers to perpetuate their control of the Associations. "Desirable members, good Republicans," he added, "were excluded," "sometimes by direct rejection, but oftener by a refusal to act on the names presented, by hanging them up in a committee which never reports." Mr. Bliss then described the other tricks of the "inspectors" and the "henchmen," and wound up with a most dismal wail of despair. "He had tried," he said, "in vain, in his weak way, to bring about that reform from within which he believed to be essential to the usefulness or long continuance of the organization," but "had accomplished little except to receive the sneers and slurs of those who glory in fraud because they profit by it, and whose approval is a disgrace to any honorable man."

We presume there was hardly a reform eye in New York which did not drop what the Colorado man called a "good square tear" over this modest picture of Mr. Bliss's exertions, sacrifices, and final collapse. There was nothing left him in 1879 to boast of, as the result of his toils, but the hatred of the wicked, which is always an unsubstantial trophy. The degeneration predicted by Mr. Schultz had clearly gone far, and the end was near. The period of ten years expires this year, and we thought the time for reorganization had come, and that Mr. Bliss would lead the demand for it in the late Convention.

It now appears that in spite of long and careful observation we little knew our man. He appeared at the Convention as the opponent of reorganization. Moreover, he justifies his conduct in a letter to Tuesday's *Times*, in which he maintains, not that the process of degeneration has been arrested, but apparently that there never was any degeneration at all. The pea is not only not under the thimble we have selected, but it never was under it. Indeed, he does not know what we mean by thimble. Within two years he has heard of no "new flagrant case of abuse." Moreover, although the proportion of the Republicans of the city who take part in the primaries is small, it is, he says, as large as the proportion in the country. Finally, the reason why there are so few names on the rolls is that "you can't get the bulk of the Republicans to take part in any permanent organization," so he does not want any reorganization. The present organization is good enough, he says, for any little reform that may be needed, and he intimates that, if it does not effect it, at some future time—which he is careful not to fix—he will join in asking for the intervention of the State Convention.

What it is which has arrested the process of degeneration described by our erratic friend in 1879, and brought back the halcyon days of 1876, and which has converted Mr. Bliss from a broken-hearted martyr into a smug and satisfied manager, we do not profess to know. It can hardly be any purely human agency. But we would warn those who think they may count on having Mr. Bliss's support in seeking reorganization some time

or other, not to be too confident, for it is all but certain that his time will not be their time, and that when they call on him he will give his opinion of them in language, as the reporters say, "the reverse of complimentary."

THE TREASURY AND THE MONEY MARKET.

THE present stringency in the money market is due in part undoubtedly to the operations of the Treasury, whereby several millions of dollars have been temporarily locked up to meet the December call for bonds to be redeemed. Inasmuch as these calls and withdrawals of loanable funds are frequent, and as they generally produce an artificial stringency, the question is asked whether means cannot be devised to take the Treasury out of the money market altogether. Too much power and responsibility are lodged in the hands of the Secretary under existing law and practice. Under present arrangements money comes into the Treasury much faster than it goes out in the course of ordinary disbursement. Consequently it becomes necessary to make extraordinary disbursements—that is, to buy in or redeem portions of the public debt from time to time with the surplus. The amounts and times of redemption are purely arbitrary, within the limits of the Secretary's available means. Consequently the money market is exposed to occasional jerks and spasms, and the Secretary himself, however unquestionable may be the rectitude of his conduct, is exposed to the suspicion of improper motives, for it would be quite within his power to put the prices of securities and of many staple articles up or down at his will. No such suspicion has attached to Secretary Windom, but the purest man in the world could not escape it forever if, as is sure to happen, some men were enriched and others impoverished as incidents of his official action. It is needless to add that a dishonest Secretary could do an immense amount of mischief without much danger of legal detection.

It is an axiom of fiscal science that the public treasury should meddle not at all with private business. It should operate neither for nor against any class of citizens. It does operate against some and in favor of others when, voluntarily or involuntarily, it takes out of the common stock of trade more money than it has immediate use for. Very likely its influence at the present time has been exaggerated, but it ought not to exist at all. The fault is in the law, or in the absence of law, regulating specifically the method of applying the surplus revenues to the extinguishment of the public debt.

There are two ways of meeting the difficulty. One is to repeal taxes and stop the flow of money into the Treasury beyond the amount needed for the ordinary expenses of the Government. This would put an end to the process of national debt-paying, and would run counter to public opinion on that subject, and would be unwise financially as well as politically. The other way is to establish by law a mode of redeeming the public debt with surplus revenues, which shall conform to Adam Smith's first axiom of taxation—viz., to take out and keep out of the pockets of the people as little as possible. Secretary Win-

dom's success in dealing with the extended 6s and 5s has put \$588,000,000 of bonds within reach of the Government at any time. No holder of any of these securities can complain if his bond is drawn by lot and paid off. It has been customary to give two or three months' notice of intention to redeem bonds, but the length of the notice is discretionary. There is no reason for waiting till ten or twelve millions of money is drained out of the channels of trade and then waiting ninety days more to send it back. The ordinary operations of the Treasury—i. e., the accumulations of money for pensions and interest and other regular disbursements—are in themselves sufficiently obstructive to business, as has been shown by a careful analysis in the current number of the *International Review*. But since we have no fiscal agency like the Bank of England to take charge of all Government collections and pay all Government dues—whereby the Government's money is never out of the money market although always on hand when required—we must make shift to put up with this inconvenience. But there is no valid excuse for jerking the money market by successive pulls of ten million dollars. It is not merely "Wall street" that is affected, but every trade centre in the United States, besides many important ones in Europe. To provide means for disbursing the surplus revenues by small instalments and at frequent intervals, is a mere matter of detail. Secretary Windom can add to his renown by making suggestions to this end in his forthcoming report to Congress.

WILL WIMBLES.

MR. THOMAS HUGHES's attempt to provide a refuge in Tennessee for the large class of young Englishmen whom he calls "Will Wimbles," after one of Sir Roger de Coverley's friends in Addison's *Spectator*, is said to be a failure, owing mainly to the poverty of the land and the remoteness of the markets. An acute writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette* maintains that there is another and more potent cause to be found in the quality of the Will Wimbles. The Will Wimbles are the young men who are educated in the public schools and Universities, or at least in the public schools, and are turned out into the world between eighteen and twenty-one, without any special training whatever, but with the manners and instincts of gentlemen, and with entire willingness to take to any calling but the lower walks of "trade." The great body of them are the sons of middle-class parents, clergymen, doctors, lawyers, and small squires, whose means are very moderate, and who have to submit to more or less privation in order to send their sons to the public schools at all. They do it in order to launch them in the world unmistakably in the gentle class, and in order to enable them to form their first social relations in that class. Unfortunately, however, as the writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette* points out, the tone and temper of the public schools, and their way of looking at life, are the products of a vague but none the less powerful assumption that every boy is the son of a man with about five thousand pounds a year. The whole at-

mosphere of the school is permeated with this assumption. The boys' code of manners is formed in it. Their intercourse with each other is more or less influenced by it, and they all look out on the world up to their last day at school with the eyes of youths whose home is a well-equipped manor-house surrounded by a prosperous estate.

The love of the middle-class Englishman of every age for this point of view is curiously exemplified in the social articles not only in the "society papers," properly so called, but in the *Saturday Review*. The troubles and perplexities and minor disappointments of life form a favorite topic with the writer of the "sub-leaders" in this last-named paper, but they are always of the troubles, perplexities, and disappointments of a landed gentleman who keeps hunters, and has a stud groom and extensive covers. He hardly ever examines the state of mind of any one less well-to-do than a younger son whose means only allow him to hunt two days in a week instead of six, and who has to rely on invitations for his shooting. These and their sisters, cousins, and aunts, apparently form the reviewer's entire world, and the only world in which there are any social phenomena worth discussion. It is, in other words, a world made up exclusively of "gentlemen," and of the persons, male and female, who wait upon them. Its sorrows are the sorrows of gentlemen, and arise mostly out of the failure of some amusement, or the loss of the money with which amusements are provided, the missing of some social distinction, or the misconduct of "upper servants." It is, however, really the only world that the English public-school boy or University man sees, or hears of, or thinks about while *in statu pupillari*. This is true, let his own home be never so modest, or the sacrifices made by his father to secure him the fashionable curriculum be never so painful. The result is, of course, that when his "education" is finished, he is really only prepared for what is technically called a gentleman's life. He has only thought of certain employments as possible to him, and all these are exceedingly hard to get. The manners of the great bulk of mankind, too, are more or less repulsive to him, and so is a good deal of the popular morality. In short, he is turned out a Will Wimple—or in other words, a good-hearted, kindly, gentlemanly, honorable fellow, who is, however, entirely unfitted for the social milieu in which he must not only live, but make a living.

Mr. Hughes's idea has been that though he dislikes trade, and is a little too nice for it as now carried on, at least on the retail side, he has an innate liking and readiness for agriculture, and that if enabled to till the soil under pleasant, or at least not too novel, social conditions, he would do it successfully. Out of this the Rugby, Tennessee, experiment has grown, and if it has not actually failed, as some say, it is certainly too early to pronounce it a success. At all events, the signs that it is going to fail are numerous. Among them is the deep disappointment of the settlers, few of whom probably realized not only the monotony and drudgery of labor in the fields—

these things can be borne by men with stout hearts and strong arms—but its effect in unfitting a man for any kind of amusement. There has been much delusion on this subject in this country, where far more is known by the reading class about all kinds of manual labor than is known in England. The possibility of working hard in the fields and keeping up at the same time some process of intellectual culture, has been much preached among us both by educational projectors and social reformers, though nearly every man who listens to them here knows the effect of physical toil in the open air in producing sleepiness and mental inertness. It is not surprising, therefore, that it should find ready acceptance in England among people who think ability to bear a hard day on the moors after grouse, or a long run in the saddle after the hounds, argues capacity to hoe potatoes or corn for twelve hours, and settle down in the evening, after a bath and a good dinner, to Dante, or Wallace, or Huxley.

Will Wimbles are much less common among us than in England. We fortunately have not a dozen great endowments used in turning them out, or a large and rich society occupied in spreading the gentlemanly view of life. But they, nevertheless, are more numerous than is altogether pleasant. The difficulty which our college graduate experiences in getting room for what the newspapers call his "bark" on the stream of life, is one of the standing jokes of our light literature. We have no schools which take the place of the English public schools in our scheme of education. But the view of life which prevails in the English public schools, and turns out the Will Wimbles, is more or less prevalent in our colleges, and tends to spread as the wealth of the class which sends its boys to college increases. In other words, colleges are to a much greater extent than they used to be places in which social relations are formed, rather than places of preparation for the active work of life. This last character, indeed, they almost wholly lost when they ceased to have the training of ministers as their main function. Scarcely any man who can afford it now likes to refuse his son a college education if the boy wants it; but probably not one boy in one thousand can say, five years after graduating, that he has been helped by his college education in making his start in life. It may have been never so useful to him as a means of moral and intellectual culture, but it has not helped to adapt him to the environment in which he has to live and work; or, in other words, to a world in which not one man in a hundred thousand has either the manners or cultivation of a gentleman, or changes his shirt more than once a week, or eats with a fork.

College education is prevented from suffering as much from this source in popular estimation in England as it does here, by the fact that, owing to the peculiar political traditions of the country, college-bred men begin life in a large number of cases in possession of great advantages of other kinds, such as hereditary wealth. Here they have almost all to face the world on their own merits, and in so far as they face it feebly or unskilfully their defects

are set down in the popular mind to the fact that they went to college. If the discredit ended here, it would perhaps be of small consequence. But it may be safely said that the college graduate is never seen groping about in a helpless and timid way for "a position," and shrinking from the turmoil and dirt of some walks of life, without spreading among the uncultivated a contempt for culture, and increasing their confidence in the rule of thumb. The mere "going to college" is recognized as a sign of pecuniary ease, and of a desire for social advancement, but not as preparation for the kind of work the bulk of the community is doing, and thus makes mental culture seem less desirable, and cultivated men less potent, especially in politics. The question is a serious one for all colleges, and it is not here only, but in England and France, that it is undergoing grave consideration. In Germany society may be said to have been organized as an appendage to the Universities, but here the Universities are simply appendages to society, which is continually doubting whether their existence can be justified.

THE METROPOLITAN CASINO.

THE Metropolitan Concert Hall, although only a year old, is already interesting as the theatre of several experiments in the way of furnishing a place of popular amusement and recreation. Its history illustrates the difficulties which surround all new attempts of the kind in New York, and at the same time the success it has had shows the opportunities which undoubtedly exist here for the development of new varieties of entertainment. Originally planned as a sort of American beer-garden, the first obstacle it encountered was of a peculiarly American description—an unwillingness on the part of some of the subscribers to permit the sale of beer. They liked the idea of a beer-garden, but they were unalterably opposed to the idea of beer. A temperance beer-garden would have been a curious experiment. It would have been a powerful reminder to the thirsty German of the difference between a race which considers amusement an end in itself, and one which regards it with distrust because it amuses. But it was fated that this should not be. The anti-beer party was left out in the cold, and the concert hall fell into the hands of energetic epicureans thoroughly imbued with European ideas on the subject of pleasure, combined with a spirit of enterprise and innovation purely American. Their idea appears to have been to combine the features of a summer beer-garden with an American restaurant, and in thinking how this might be done they hit upon a novel plan, for which they deserve the everlasting praise of every New Yorker, and which we are convinced has a great future before it—we mean the idea of using the roof of the building as a sort of garden.

Hitherto every attempt at a garden in New York had been a ghastly failure. When any one had undertaken to set up a "garden" he generally utilized a back yard for the purpose, which, being enclosed by high walls, always resembled a cellar with the top taken off much more than anything else, and was totally unventilated, close, hot, and generally damp. There was a shocking garden of this kind in connection with Thomas's old concert hall. There was another in Fifth avenue, a few years ago, which was made to seem all the more

like a magnified area by being called a *jardin d'hôte*. There is another in Twenty-third street, where lofty brick walls surround a space in shape something like a tennis court, and in gloom the bottom of a well. Now all these "gardens" were based on a theory the erroneous nature of which the managers of the Metropolitan Concert Hall were first to perceive. The fact is that the price of ground in New York is so enormous that obtaining any large space for a purpose of this kind is out of the question; and yet for a real garden this is absolutely essential. It is economically impossible that the same space should not be turned to a far more profitable account by being built over. Hence the only available spaces for "gardens" are just those spaces which are of least use for such a purpose—little bits of land in the rear of buildings, which cannot very well be built on without making the front building inconvenient—or, in other words, the back yards.

But there is one place which is always accessible, always exposed to the air, always free from surrounding walls, and always cheap. The roof in a city like New York is obviously destined to take the place which in other cities is occupied by gardens on the surface of the ground. It rains very little in New York in summer, and there are few cities in the world where the atmosphere on the level of the street is more unendurable. There is everything in favor of the roof, and nothing to be said against it except that it has not been sufficiently introduced to make the idea familiar. Prejudice is the hardest thing in the world to root out, and it must be confessed that the Anglo-Saxon has a prejudice against the roof, simply for the reason that hitherto in Anglo-Saxondom, the roof has not been utilized in the way we suggest. The founders of the Metropolitan Concert Hall, however, were unprejudiced men, and they determined to make the idea of frequenting and using the roof familiar to everybody. The only mistake they made, it seems to us, was that they did not carry it far enough; they constructed a roof round their building, like an uncovered veranda, and the fundamental correctness of this theory has often been proved on warm evenings, when the interior of the building was nearly empty and the roof thronged with a crowd of people altogether too numerous for it. If they had taken the entire roof, it would have been crowded. The Metropolitan Concert Hall has already proved that the roof theory is right, and if you adopt it, you clearly cannot have too much roof. When we think of the enormous amount of roof space in New York, of the almost universal use of elevators, and the erection of taller and taller buildings, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that we are on the eve of a great development in the use of the roof as the American substitute for the European garden.

The Metropolitan Concert Hall, having developed the idea of the roof, has now undertaken another experiment, which is as yet perhaps in too early a stage to admit of any very confident prediction as to its success. The plan seems to be to make it into a place of amusement for the winter, combining the features of a vaudeville theatre with a *café chantant*—a place where you can amuse yourself by listening to music, or dine, or smoke, or talk. It is curious that there are no places of this sort in New York, except the German beer-gardens, in which, however, you have only instrumental music. The American theatres which attempt this kind of thing are of a very low order—theatres in which the line between the audience and the performers is not drawn as strictly as it would be at legitimate theatres, and

where the vulgarity of the performance makes it utterly uninteresting to persons of cultivation and refinement. To go from the legitimate theatres to these places of amusement suggests the reflection that there is as yet no half-way place with Americans between the stiff and the disreputable; no such thing as careless ease and the harmless pursuit of unconventional amusement. The attempt of the new management at the Metropolitan Concert Hall to occupy this ground will therefore be watched with interest. But the performance on Monday night made the success of the experiment seem still problematical. The place has been converted into a theatre, and a well-known company opened it that night with "Olivette." Of the performance little need be said. "Olivette" and the "Mascotte" occupy at present in the operatic world much the same position that "Pinafore" did a few years since. That is to say, a manager who cannot get up an "Olivette" or "Mascotte" is not worth his salt. The airs are all familiar to the public, and the more familiar they become, the better they seem to be liked. Miss Catherine Lewis, who took the part of *Olivette*, is a favorite with the New York public, and was received by a crowded house with great applause. Her voice has improved within the last two years, and her singing of the "I will obey" song in the second act was as good as anything of the kind we have heard off the French stage. Mr. Howson, who took the part of *Merrimac*, has a great reputation as a humorist of the true English school, and achieves marked hits by extraordinary faces, sudden changes of voice, and a very stiff leg. The choruses were good, and Mr. Paxton's singing of *Valentine's* part was so ludicrously bad that it caused almost an uproar of amusement. But the most noticeable thing about the performance was that after all it was just such an evening's entertainment as might have been had at any other theatre. A stage has taken the place of the restaurant, and the main hall has been filled with long rows of chairs, as any concert hall or theatre is filled. In the rear, under the galleries, and in the boxes up-stairs, people sat at tables, drank beer, ate ices, smoked, and talked. Opposite the stage on the second floor was the restaurant, where people seemed to be actively dining all the evening. But notwithstanding all this the place could hardly be said to be a *café chantant*, any more than Booth's or Daly's. It is a theatre surrounded by a very large café. The two are entirely distinct. As long as you are in the theatre there is nothing either on the stage or in the audience to distinguish the entertainment from any other theatrical performance. The moment you leave the theatre you get into a café, where you look at the performance from a distance, much as you might from the street. The plan has this to recommend it, that you can get away from the theatre without going into the street, but the formality which reigns in the body of the hall is complete; we did not observe a single person get up and leave his seat, except during the *entr'actes*. On the whole, the Metropolitan Casino can hardly as yet be said to have provided New York with a *café chantant* or a vaudeville theatre. It is something different from these, as it is from a beer-garden. Whether it will prove a successful American substitute for all three remains to be seen.

GARFIELD IN LONDON.

LONDON, September 26, 1881.

WE are prone to call ourselves a cynical generation, and to affirm that the worthier qualities of human nature are not much in demand, nor even in great repute. But the effect of President

Garfield's death has been to quash the significance of this jaunty attitude. History holds no record of any scamp, however successful, any demagogue, however blatant, or any complying rogue, however servicable, whose death has made any memorable ripple on the surface of events. The touch of death has the magic power which either transmutes the man into gold or reveals his essential dross. We look upon Garfield as a hero; and certainly, if any man's claim to the title be valid, his is so. But his heroism consists not in his being above or outside of human nature, but in his being more fully than most men within it. Whatever elements were great in him exist in their germ at least in all men—even in him whose dreary fate it was to be his murderer. And the use which he served to mankind lay not in the practical work he did or might have done, but in the timely indication he gave of the power and possibilities of human virtue. Men who live active lives know how hard it is to be just where injustice is so easy; to be honest where dishonesty is so profitable; and to show moral courage where politeness is so fashionable and conciliating. It is the justice, the honesty, and the courage of Garfield—not his ability—that make his memory precious. Because he lived as he lived, and died as he died, it will henceforth be less easy than it was for immorality to appear respectable; and the good that is latent in the race will receive a new impulse and development. The hearty simplicity and kindness of his disposition, not less than the long duration of his suffering, have vastly multiplied the numbers of those who sympathize with our country's loss. The extent and vitality of that sympathy have astonished even those who feel it. Such an emotion, coming as it does at a political season so full of sinister omens as the present, when the rulers of Europe are glancing threateningly at one another's throats, may conceivably exercise an influence wider than the immediate cause of it can postulate, and destined to be memorable in the moral history of mankind.

The meeting of Americans in London to do honor to the late President's memory was worth seeing and hearing. Exeter Hall is not, indeed, a place especially suitable for such a gathering; and it was suggested (but too late for the hint to be acted upon) that Saint Paul's Cathedral might have been had for the purpose. But this was a minor matter. The hall, such as it was, was filled to overflowing with upwards of three thousand of our countrymen and women. The seats not having been reserved (except a limited number on the platform), this large audience began to assemble long before the hour appointed for the meeting to be opened; and by half-past three all the seats were occupied. An untoward incident occurred at this time—a personage whose speech seemed to indicate English nationality, and whose appearance and vociferousness suggested intoxication, giving way to his feelings in such a manner as to necessitate the interference of a policeman and summary ejection. What sentiments they were that strove to find utterance through him did not transpire. Except for this the audience remained hushed and undemonstrative until, punctually at four o'clock, Mr. James Russell Lowell appeared and took the chair, supported by General Merritt, Bishop Simpson, Rev. Dr. Channing, Mr. Moncure D. Conway, Mr. J. S. Morgan, and others. Mr. Lowell's opening address was in every respect worthy of the deep attention and appreciation with which it was listened to. The American Minister's voice is clear, penetrating, and of measured and just intonation; his language is not more scholarly than it is simple and eloquent. It is not often that a man

whose eminence has been attained in other ways has shown so singular a command of the resources of oratory. It was gratifying to see—and the spectacle is not a common one—a man in every way fitted to be the leader and mouthpiece of a great assemblage, acting in that capacity. In Mr. Lowell's position speechmaking is a constant necessity, and the difficulty of saying the right thing at the right time and place is much enhanced by the frequency of the demand. Uniformly felicitous and weighty as he is, however, Mr. Lowell was perhaps never so much so as on this occasion. Deliberate rather than impulsive in manner, and never allowing himself to be carried away by his subject, his every word nevertheless carried the impress of deep sincerity and cordial sentiment, and the impression which he produced of holding power in reserve augmented the effect of all he uttered. The substance of what he said will already have been made known to American readers, and the reports in English newspapers were unusually accurate. It is my object to touch only upon such points of these events as are not likely to find mention elsewhere. A noteworthy feature of his, and of all the addresses delivered on that afternoon, was the quick responsiveness of the audience. It is now many years since the present writer has had an opportunity of mingling with an assemblage of his countrymen; and this sensitiveness of apprehension and recognition, so much more marked than would be the case in a similar collection of Englishmen, strongly impressed him. The sympathies of English people may be as deep as our own, but a certain coldness and stiffness of temperament prevents their giving it adequate expression.

Mr. Lowell was followed by General Merritt, who spoke with manifest emotion; and his speech made its mark, though something seemed to be amiss with his quotation of President Garfield's words during the excitement and consternation following the assassination of Lincoln: "Fellow-citizens, God reigns, and the Government at Washington lives!" No doubt Garfield expressed in some way the truth that "God and the Continental Congress" would not leave the nation in the lurch; but it appears possible that he may have put it in a way less open to the charge of anti-climax. Bishop Simpson's address was full of eloquence of a picturesque type which recalls the earlier and simpler days of the Republic. His voice has the undisguised American intonation which falls so pleasantly on the ear after a lengthened experience of English Parliamentary utterance; and he had the true orator's faculty of perceiving what the audience wished to hear, and saying it with all his heart. His allusion to Queen Victoria called forth a spontaneous and unpremeditated burst of enthusiasm, the like of which is not often seen anywhere. "The Queen of the greatest empire on the earth," he said, "drops a tear beside his widow, and lays a wreath upon his tomb." This sentence was received with cheers; but when the Bishop continued, raising his arms and speaking with great energy, "God bless Queen Victoria for her womanly sympathy and queenly courtesy!" many persons in different parts of the hall started from their seats, and in another moment the whole audience rose in a mass, and cheered repeatedly with all the strength of their lungs. It was a spectacle not easily to be forgotten. And, indeed, the Queen has fully merited the affectionate recognition which she is now receiving from Americans. Her telegram to Mrs. Garfield, her wreath of flowers for his coffin, and her decree of a week's mourning for the President, are evidences of tender sympathy which are only less royal and English than they are human and feminine. But the

whole state of feeling created by this tragedy of ours is novel and wonderful, and kindles hopes which outweigh the fears that anarchy and tyranny arouse.

Bishop Simpson drew forth tears from many of his hearers when he told how the President's mother, on hearing of his assassination, cried out: "How could any one be so cruel and so wicked as to kill my baby!" As Mr. Lowell had already expressed it, it was all so human! The formalities and conventionalities of mankind are of great practical convenience, but they do nothing to promote the feeling of brotherhood between men and nations. On occasions like this they appear in the light of very flimsy rags indeed, and the strange fact that all men alike love good and hate evil comes into unsuspected prominence. I have not space to touch upon the remarks made by Channing and Conway, nor to describe the scene on Monday evening, in the church of St. Martin-in-the-fields, when the Archbishop of Canterbury delivered a touching and eloquent address before a truly gigantic congregation. All England has been in mourning to-day, and we have not yet seen the result in which these things may issue. J. H.

PRUSSIA'S REPRESENTATIVES AT YORKTOWN.

BERLIN, September 24, 1881.

HERR VON SCHLOEZER, having left Rome on the 18th instant, arrived here on the 20th, conferred with Ministers Puttkamer and Gossler, and on the following day started for Varzin to report to the Chancellor the result of his negotiations. As these have been carried on between the Ambassador and Cardinal Jacobini without the interference or presence of anybody else, as the Papal See knows how to keep its secrets, and as the German negotiator is too obedient a supporter of Bismarck to reveal any of his achievements, if there be any, and too eagerly bent upon obtaining the prize sought for by him, nothing of course has transpired, or for the present will transpire, about the terms on which a settlement has been reached. Whatever the papers, therefore, say about their number and character is mere fiction or guess-work. So much only appears certain from the admissions of our official press, that it was Bismarck who almost pressed a German Ministership upon Rome. Schloezer is of course a *persona gratissima* to the Pope. In the only audience which the latter granted him, Leo XIII. expressed his ardent wish to receive him soon as the duly accredited and permanent German Minister. This fact proves that an understanding which promises duration has been brought about between Berlin and Rome, for it cannot be supposed that the old diplomatic relations will be taken up again with the intent of breaking them off at the first opportunity.

It would be preposterous to draw from this speedy settlement of old animosities and conflicts conclusions derogatory to the dignity and authority of the German Government, but I cannot deny that the mere fact of secret agreements makes me rather suspicious. It is not customary for Rome to expedite business with foreign powers, but rather to procrastinate negotiations under all possible pretexts and simulations. This quick conclusion of peace is, in the eyes of all impartial observers, *prima-facie* evidence that something is wrong on Bismarck's side. Another fact which does not augur well for the success of his policy is an article published a few days ago by the *Pbst*, an official paper, which throws all the blame on the Liberals who left the National Liberal party, the so-called Secessionists, if the Government should fail to reestablish amicable relations with the Papal See. "By separating from their old friends," it says, "they

weakened the Liberal party and threw the balance of power on the side of the Centre." Now it was Bismarck who at the election of 1873 did all in his power to crush the National Liberals and to strengthen the Conservatives, and it was Bismarck, again, who during the sessions of the last Reichstag made the Centre the most important, if not the decisive party in influence and numbers. The secession, however, took place on August 31, 1880, and can of course not be made responsible for a policy which has preferred Ultramontane help to Liberal co-operation. If Rome thus has an undue influence on the interior policy of Germany, it is the Chancellor who has brought about this anomalous state of things, and it is more than ridiculous to make the Secessionists the scapegoats, if Bismarck should really go to Canossa. He likes parliamentary support when it serves him to cover his acts or shield him from responsibility; but in all other respects he considers it a nuisance, with which a statesman must try to get along as well as he can.

In this regard an anecdote characteristic of the Chancellor has lately been made public by a former deputy by the name of Berger, a Conservative and Protectionist. "In 1877," Herr Berger says, "the Chancellor once told me that constitutional government could only be carried on if, as in England, the Prime Minister were at the same time the leader of the majority in Parliament. I," continues Herr Berger, "objected that only the reverse was correct; that on the contrary in England the leader of the House of Commons was made Minister-President. Bismarck replied that we could not transplant to Prussia the half-republican institutions which prevailed in England, because the latter was an island, while Prussia's situation between two great military powers was much more exposed. For this reason," Herr Berger again objected, "a parallel could not be drawn between the two powers, as the conditions of their existence were quite different. Bismarck broke off the conversation with the remark that he wanted a majority like that which Louis Napoleon had had in his Corps Législatif."

The meeting of the Prussian Landtag, if not first that of the Reichstag, will throw official light upon the Chancellor's plans, for as soon as he asks for the salary of his Roman Minister he must explain the views and reasons justifying his demand. It is not yet settled whether the new minister is to be appointed in the name of Germany or Prussia. Bismarck, you know, is Secretary of State of both Governments, and can take his choice. If the impending elections for the Reichstag should result in his favor, he will, I believe, apply to it for funds; if not, he will find a ready instrument in the Landtag, where Ultramontanes and Conservatives always have a compact majority for measures of this character; even if the worst apprehensions, which I cannot yet entertain, should be realized.

The death of President Garfield, although anticipated for several weeks and a relief to the noble sufferer, has been received here with the sincerest regret and the deepest emotion by all classes of society. On the day the news arrived our Foreign Office addressed a note of condolence to the American Chargé d'Affaires, Mr. Everett, and men prominent in science and in politics called at the Legation; moreover, the citizens of the United States residing in Berlin, German-Americans, and Germans are preparing a celebration commemorating the services and merits of the deceased President. What will take place here is announced from other cities, like Hamburg and Bremen, Leipzig and Dresden, Stuttgart and Frankfurt. The German newspapers do not look on Mr. Arthur's succession with pessimistic eyes, and on the whole agree with your opinion, that a fair chance ought to be given to

the new President, who, they expect, will turn out much better than his reputation while Vice-President. In short, the sympathy of the whole German nation, without a single exception, is now as deep and general as it was sixteen years ago, when Abraham Lincoln fell a victim to the assassin's ball.

Another event which will greatly contribute to strengthen the good feelings between the two countries is the invitation which Secretary Blaine, in the name of your Government, has extended to the namesakes and relatives of Baron Steuben to participate in the centenary celebration of the surrender of Yorktown. As it was the sturdy old General to whom Lord Cornwallis made the first overtures of capitulation, and as the descendants of other prominent actors in that great drama have been invited as guests of the nation, the consideration shown to the Steuben family is a tribute of gratitude which in itself is not extraordinary. It, however, assumes a higher importance from the noble-hearted and appreciative motives with which Secretary Blaine has set forth the disposition of the American people towards Germany and the German-Americans. It is chiefly due to the exertions and tact of your late Berlin Minister, Mr. Andrew D. White, that this flattering testimonial to the services of Baron Steuben has been proffered to his family, and through them to the German people. The original invitation of July 30, having been published by your papers, needs no repetition on my part, but allow me to state the other side of the story, the comment of Prince Bismarck, his report to the Emperor, and the resolution based on that report.

The officers invited are Colonel von Steuben, commander of the Seventy-ninth Regiment (Third Hanoverian), at Hildesheim; Captains von Steuben of the Fourth Regiment of the Guards, at Spandau, and of the Ninety-eighth Infantry, at Brandenburg, and three Lieutenants von Steuben of the Thirty-ninth, Twenty-second, and Seventy-ninth Regiments, sons of the above-named colonel. The Chancellor having been summoned by the Emperor to give his views on the subject, says that in his opinion the invitation is an enviable acknowledgment of the services of a former prominent German officer which cannot be appreciated too highly, and which, in the eyes of the world, adds a new laurel wreath to the previous history of the Prussian army. He especially dwells on the modest manner in which the American Secretary attributes some of the greatest results of the Revolutionary war to the merits of Steuben as a disciplinarian, and compares it with the unjustifiably haughty tone in which almost all Englishmen treat the decisive intervention of the Prussian army in the battle of Waterloo, although it was solely won by the timely participation of old Blücher. The Chancellor therefore most heartily recommends acceptance of the flattering invitation, and giving a furlough to the above officers accordingly. This acceptance would not only please the United States Government, but would at the same time give universal satisfaction to our officers, who piously cherish the traditions of the times of the great Frederic, to whose favorite disciples Steuben had belonged. Besides, he thinks it impossible that the acceptance of the invitation should cause any uneasiness in England, as that country took a lively interest in the Philadelphia Exhibition, which had been expressly held for the centennial celebration of the Declaration of American Independence. Consequently the capture of Yorktown, crowning the efforts of a long war, could not form an exception to the rule which the English Government observed in its relations towards its former colonies.

In keeping with this memorial, the Emperor issued his decree, and expressed his special desire that all the Steubens should go to Yorktown in order to represent there the Prussian army and the whole German Fatherland. Without waiting to be asked for it, he has given an eight weeks' furlough to the above-named six officers, who will sail next week from Bremen for New York. The news of this extraordinary invitation has for several days been the principal subject of talk among our officers. The other day a jovial young captain complained to me that his mother's maiden name was Steuben, but that unfortunately it had not devolved on him, for otherwise he would have made the trip to America with his cousins, which would, of course, have offered him really "feudal" pleasure and "Titanic, glacier-like, pyramidal" enjoyment with those fellows yonder. The Steubens, however, who will be your guests are worthy representatives of our country, and will, I am sure, win the esteem and respect of your people. +++

THE EGYPTIAN CRISIS.

CAIRO, Sept. 20, 1881.

IF the teachings of Oriental history are to be believed, the events of the past week are merely the prelude to a crisis which must form an epoch in Egyptian annals. Aside from purely political reasons, Western influence, enterprise, and management have gained the ascendancy in Egypt with a rapidity utterly incomprehensible to the Turkish and Egyptian officials of the old régime. Although distasteful to many of the native Egyptians, it is this influence alone which distinguishes Egypt from all other Eastern lands, and which promises to rescue her from the blight of Moslem stagnation. When Ismail Pasha was deposed, the five great Powers of Europe undertook to make themselves responsible for the good government and administration of Egypt. By the establishment of the Control-System the Powers delegated to England and France the task of enforcing upon Egypt a government compatible with Western progress. The Control-System became a *fait accompli*, and England and France maintained it by holding forth the terrible but vague alternative of some kind of foreign intervention. For two years this was sufficient, but the events of the 9th of September now show that nothing less than military force is competent to support the position which Western civilization has assumed in Egypt; and if England and France find it impracticable to make use of such force, then they must stand aside, relinquish their trust, and together with the other powers play a subordinate rôle in the struggle between the effete and decaying civilization of the Moslem and the progressive and vivifying civilization of the Frank.

Last February an Egyptian regiment, on account of grievances partly imaginary and partly real, revolted, and demanded and obtained the removal of the Minister of War. On September 9 the whole Egyptian army, some nine thousand troops of all arms, surrounded the Palace, and held the Khedive and his ministers prisoners, while Ahmet Bey el Araby, an Egyptian colonel, but the *de facto* dictator of Egypt, sword in hand, demanded the dismissal of the Riaz Ministry, a Constitution and Parliament, and an immediate increase of the army. The first demand was conceded, and the other two were, by mutual consent, referred to the Sultan. For three days all order was paralyzed, and it was impossible to form a new Ministry. At last Sherif Pasha consented to take office, and he is at the present moment doing his best to conciliate all parties, and to act as a stopgap until some permanent arrangement can be arrived at. So long as the

power rests with the army there can be no guarantee for the future. Last February the colonels demanded the dismissal of one unpopular Minister; to-day they demand a total change not only of the Ministry, but of the form of Government; and what may they not demand to-morrow? The situation is most critical, and can only be solved by the complete disbanding of the army—a measure not likely to be agreed to—or by European or Turkish intervention, which is fraught with European complications of the most alarming nature. Well-informed persons feel confident that Araby Bey's action is connected with a great Mohammedan rising in Northern Africa—a movement fomented and directed by certain influential personages in Constantinople; and the *Hedjaz*, a Panislam journal published in Cairo, significantly speaks of Araby Bey as the second Prophet, who is to reestablish the Arab Khalifate. The same journal warns Europeans not to meddle with the internal affairs of Egypt, and complains of the large number of European employees of the Government. It says if Europeans act badly, Egyptians can act worse, and calls for a radical change in the status of Europeans in Egypt. Since last spring Araby Bey has been in communication with the Bedouin chiefs of Upper Egypt, and it is said that recently he has won over the Bedouins of Lower Egypt also. These Bedouins take no interest in matters at Cairo or Alexandria, but would be only too glad of any opportunity to steal and plunder. They are by no means a tranquillizing element in the problem, and happily there is no immediate fear of their intervention.

Araby Bey is not influenced by personal ambition. He is a fanatic, who knows the Koran by heart, who speaks eloquently, and who feels that he is entrusted with a mission to deliver Egypt from foreign influence. The army obeys him blindly, and believes him to be gifted with divine inspiration. As head of the army, he issued a circular to the foreign consuls on the 9th of September, assuring them that Europeans had no cause for fear. The order and regularity with which the military movements were executed are sufficient evidence of his complete authority.

Correspondence.

MR. PARTON AND HIS PRINTER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I am much indebted to you for pointing out my error in the translation of the Latin lines placed by Voltaire over his laboratory at the château of Cirey. The error was egregious, and well deserved rebuke. "Peccus" was an oversight, but this was a deliberate and inexcusable mistake, owing to the rusty condition of my Latin from long disuse. You intimate that the "printer" and the "proof-reader" may be in fault, and should be "sharply looked after." Not so. It is they who looked sharply after me, and enabled me to produce the 'Life of Voltaire' reasonably free from verbal mistakes. The critics have corrected several errors, for which I thank them; but my vigilant proof-reader of the Riverside Press saved me from many more.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES PARTON.

NEWBURYPORT, MASS., Oct. 8, 1881.

MANLY AND WOMANLY BEAUTY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the reply of the Editor to "C. D. M." on "The Sexual Theory of Games," in the *Nation* for September 1, you make use of the same

argument (fallacious, *me judice*) which women use to explain the generally admitted lower activity of the female intellect, to account for the hypothetical higher perfection of female beauty—i.e., heredity. Will you permit me to question this higher perfection, to begin with, and, even if compelled to yield, on the principle of *de gustibus*, etc., to dispute any such tendency of heredity to develop such supposed difference between the sexes?

Let me, as a traveller who has seen much of the earth's surface and many of the races on it, state the result of my experience in the matter of the relative beauty of the sexes—viz., that the higher the civilization, and the more woman is removed from severe physical effort in her constant occupations, the higher the average of that peculiar type of beauty which we recognize as the "womanly," while that type which we consider the "manly" predominates in races whose lives are passed in vigorous athletic struggle. In certain races manly beauty is far more common than womanly, and *vice versa*, if any common standard of criticism were acknowledged; but I apprehend that when we consult women we shall find that the manly type is ranked higher, and with men the womanly type will be. At any rate, I remember that one of the most remarkable women I have known for subtlety of thought and critical faculty, when I asked her which type of beauty she regarded as the higher, replied that she did not regard women as really beautiful—she reserved the epithet for men. We must bear this distinction in mind, though the accepted nomenclature of aesthetics does not define it. I deny, therefore, that woman has a "superior beauty"; and if the two types are to be taken together, I deny equally that as a general rule women have a higher average of the quality than men. On the contrary, possibly owing to the fact that men are freer to follow their normal lives, I have found that in a majority of the countries I have visited there are more handsome men than beautiful women. This is peculiarly the case with the modern Greek, and was, if antique sculpture could be accepted as witness, with the ancient.

But supposing that the fact of superior beauty were admitted, it cannot be accounted for on the grounds you suppose. As in the case of explaining the intellectual inferiority of women by heredity and the generations of lower culture, you assume that nature has two processes of development for the two sexes, whereas the functions of father and mother in the process of reproduction are precisely the same for son or daughter, and the inheritance, whether it come by "tissue" or mental communication, is precisely the same in both cases. The daughter inherits just as much from the father as the son does, though to hear the champions of woman's "equality" we should imagine that the women had had for some generations sires of their own sex, or that nature had provided some way of imparting the father's brain tissue alone to sons, and the mother's to the daughters. The fact is that, whether in reference to beauty or intellect, there is no such distinction as a diverse sexual heredity would imply: a beautiful daughter as often derives her beauty from the father as from the mother, and so of a handsome son. All we know is that nature is excessively freakish, and that while in some families all the children resemble the father, in others all resemble the mother, and in others still the sons resemble the mother, and the daughters the father; and if the daughter of a talented man is not as intellectual, as a rule, as her brother, it is only because sex in some mysterious way interferes with the development. The most beautiful woman in the circle of my acquaintance

resembles her father, and the most beautiful boy I ever saw resembled his mother surprisingly; while, on the other hand, one of the most intellectual men I have known borrowed all his intellectual characteristics from his mother.

But "C. D. M." is utterly wrong, as a matter of fact, in supposing that women have any superiority over men in enjoyment of nature, and particularly in perception of color. Among the women who have most successfully practised art the dominant quality has not been delicacy of perception of color or refinement of treatment—the highest attainment of those qualities invariably belonging to men. And among the whole range of female artists (and we have many here in England) I do not know more than two who have shown the genuine color-feeling in a noteworthy degree. Still more widely is "C. D. M." at variance from the facts, so far as art work shows them, in attributing to women finer perception of forms; for in all women's work the element of form, as elaborated in composition or in ideal form, is rather remarkable for its absence, no woman having ever produced a composition of the highest order, or attained the highest rank in the subtle characterization of form or feature which we find in Chavet, Flaxman, Meissonier, Cruikshank, Millet, Raphael, Holbein, Titian, Masaccio, Carpaccio—all varying one from the others, but presenting a collective ideal of refinement of perception and delineation of pure form which no woman has ever approached at any point. In fact, the one quality in which alone woman's art has been excellent is that of sentiment, not perception of any kind: one might say that women do not see, they feel.—Yours truly, W.

LONDON Sept. 22.

[In claiming for man alone that discrimination in sexual selection to which we attributed the superior beauty of women, we were guided rather by a humorous than a serious intention. The question, however, has its serious side, and "W.'s" contribution to it is of interest. We do not propose to discuss the matter here, as that could not be done fully in anything short of a magazine article. It is quite true that the physical and mental characteristics of the parents are often transmitted indiscriminately to their offspring of both sexes. Schopenhauer asserted that children derive their intellectual qualities chiefly from the mother, their character from the father; but in this opinion he was largely influenced by the fact that it was so in his own case. But we know as a fact that among the lower animals beautiful colors and other ornaments are usually transmitted to one sex only. Still, the whole question of heredity is involved in the greatest darkness. Ribot's book left the subject exactly where it had been left by Darwin. We will merely add that Darwin, while admitting that women transmit most of their characters, including some beauty, to the offspring of both sexes, yet remarks: "As women have long been selected for beauty, it is not surprising that some of their successive variations should have been transmitted exclusively to the same sex; consequently, that they should have transmitted beauty in a somewhat higher degree to their female than to their male offspring, and thus have become more beautiful, according to general opinion, than men" ('Descent of Man,' part iii., chap. xx.).—ED. NATION.]

THE IDEA OF GARFIELD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your editorial in the *Nation* for September 29, entitled "What President Garfield would have done," you say: "If President Arthur, therefore, wishes to carry out either what a mourning people now vaguely think President Garfield would have accomplished, or what his recorded utterances justify us in believing that he would have accomplished, he will not confine himself to imitating what his predecessor actually did during the confusion of the first months of a Presidential term."

The topic of "what his predecessor actually did" you have discussed in a manner which leaves the mind satisfied so far as you go. It is quite probable that you thought of a further item which has occurred to me, but which you may have dismissed as being in your estimation too conjectural. It is this, that President Garfield deliberately played a game with Mr. Conkling, and skilfully beat him. It is known that the ex-Senator resigned because of one of President Garfield's movements—the displacement of Mr. Merritt for Mr. Robertson. Was this a movement designed to drive Mr. Conkling into his act of political suicide? I think this theory has confirmation so ample that it may be admitted among the topics that concern the idea of President Garfield. You yourself give Mr. Garfield unqualified praise for the thoroughness of his attainment in reference to his situation. You have asserted that he could have filled any of the departments himself. In this article again you assert, in speaking of what was done in the Treasury and Post-Office departments, that "neither [cabinet officer] could have done the work without the instigation and support of a President who saw the value of it, and could have done it himself if necessary." Thoroughness in the mastery of every situation in which he was placed was a leading trait. As the "raw colonel" he drove the veteran Marshall out of Sandy Valley. At Chickamauga he was the master spirit. When on the Committee of Ways and Means, of Banking and Currency, on Appropriations, and when he was heading the minority, still was he unresting until he was master. And are we not to believe that he made himself master of that situation in which he found himself placed with reference to the spoils system when he came to be President? Did he not take measures to acquaint himself thoroughly with the fortifications of that system? And did he not perceive that the heaviest blow he could strike would consist in his driving Mr. Conkling from his stronghold? Would he not then make Mr. Conkling his study, as he made the regions of Sandy Valley and Chickamauga; or as he made the subjects to which his attention was drawn in Congress?

It is easier to believe this than that he was "overpowered during the canvass and after his inauguration by what seemed to him overwhelming practical considerations, such as the need of some sort of reconciliation and harmony between the leaders of the party which elected him, and the impossibility of bringing this reconciliation and harmony about except in the traditional way of 'recognition' in the distribution of patronage." The practical considerations were weighty. It would have been a dire result, in his view, had he become the agency of disruption in his party. But the man who had already "taken his political life in his hands" was not to be swerved now from honesty, especially since he had made the situation his study, and had discovered the springs of action in the character of Mr. Conkling. President Garfield did not call Mr. Blaine to the chief seat in the Cabinet for the purpose of bringing about "recon-

ciliation and harmony between the leaders of the party which elected him"; he did not do this in the way of "recognition." Was not everybody saying at the time that the call of Mr. Blaine would fail to secure this end? In his secret purpose, thinking his way along, with light dawning on him as he went, independent of popular criticism, sole mover on his side the checkered board, President Garfield checked Mr. Conkling with Mr. Blaine. Players have felt provoked at chess. Senator Conkling was provoked at this game. He had been the autocrat at play before. To meet his equal was an outrage. Angered, he grew confused. Had not President Garfield read this possibility as existing among the qualities of that mind? But this was a check. The next move must be a checkmate. Mr. Conkling must be provoked into greater confusion of mind, to foolish action. The appointment of Mr. Robertson was the move that ended the game. We must grant to President Garfield all this deliberateness of purpose, or else believe in the existence in his character of an element too unnaturally contradictory. He cleared the way of the most formidable obstacle to civil-service reform. In doing so he took the risk of not being understood in case of failure, but he risked his reputation for the sake of the people. If we can let this enter into the idea of the man, let us. A nation needs models. Let us not fail to give a model American the fullest recognition.

W. W. TUFTS.

WARWICK, MASS., October 3, 1881.

CHANGE OF PUBLIC SENTIMENT IN IRELAND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Some phases of the Irish question are difficult to understand, especially by those who are not in the country. The letter of your London correspondent "Y.," in the *Nation* of September 8, contains some very just remarks on the tendency to a change in the views of Englishmen in regard to relations with Ireland. In the din of battle between extremists I think sufficient attention has not been given to the change which is gradually working its way in the minds of moderate and thoughtful Irishmen in regard to the relations of Ireland with Great Britain.

As an Irish-American, during a sojourn of some months in my native country, I have been profoundly struck by the altered tone of old acquaintances, and the deeply-rooted disgust expressed by men who idolized Mr. Gladstone when he was in Opposition, at the course of the Government in consigning Michael Davitt to a convict's cell, and being so ready to resort to coercive in advance of ameliorative legislation. In the freedom of the social circle I have again and again been surprised to find men, who a few years ago scouted the idea of home rule as chimerical, expressing the opinion that British legislation and administration had broken down, and that some radical change was necessary for the welfare of Ireland. The fact is referred to with bitterness that the direct administration of the affairs of Ireland is in the hands of a man who has the support of no section of the Irish people. The people whose opinions I refer to are for the most part Protestants and business men having no interest in land—some of them Quakers. Opinions as to a remedy vary much, and I shall not take up your space with their discussion. What is felt to be wanting is some system or understanding whereby Irish public opinion would be more felt than at present in shaping legislative and administrative measures. I do not find that my friends are much frightened by the suggestion that any concession of partial self-government would

almost inevitably lead to such a demand for complete autonomy as would be difficult to resist. Evidently the cry of "Home Rule! Home Rule!" which seemed to settle the question in the minds of most Irish Protestants a few years ago, has lost its terrors. It is seen that in no Catholic country at the present day does Rome rule, and the inference is inevitable that in a self-governed Ireland the influence of the priests would be less than at present. Indeed, in the present land movement the priests have been compelled to follow rather than to lead.

Moreover, the establishment of practical independence in most of the British colonies, and the continued success of constitutional government in France and other countries where the bulk of the people are Catholics, has had a marked effect upon the minds of many Irish Protestants. Even in Ulster there are not wanting indications that the idea of a united and self-governed Ireland is gaining ground, especially among the Protestant youth. The theory so freely put forward by Mr. Gladstone at the time of the disestablishment of the Irish Church and since—that Ireland should be ruled according to Irish ideas—has accustomed people to regard Ireland as a political unit. At the same time, the failure of the Imperial Parliament as an exponent of Irish opinion is more and more manifest.

These are some of the ideas I have found floating on the surface of men's minds here in Ireland. Will they bear fruit? I have purposely avoided reference to the Land-League agitation, because the subject is so vast. It remains to be seen what effect the recent pronouncements of the Land-League Convention, looking to the wholesale spoliation of landlords, will have upon moderate Liberals who have anything to lose, or who believe in fair dealing.

Yours respectfully,

RICHARD WEBB.

DUBLIN, Sept. 24, 1881.

HOW TO DETECT THE NATION'S JOKES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I presume that you are heartily sick of the "Flipper Case," but as an old subscriber I feel puzzled by the fact that among your intelligent readers so few can appreciate a joke unless it is labelled. I am afraid that anything like wit will be banished from your pages, and am not willing to accept even successful prediction in its place without a protest. I thought your "Flipper articles" very enjoyable, and at no time supposed that you were assailing the reputation of Col. Shafter.

I am inclined to think that a steady perusal of the political editorials of our extreme party papers, which I suppose are jokes to their authors, but cannot, unfortunately, be detected as such by their readers, together with the implicit belief in them which so many seem to have, totally unfits the mind for any appreciation of satire unless it strikes in accordance with their political creed. That I, a reader of the *New York Tribune*, could understand your joke, is probably due to the fact that I read similar papers of the Democratic faith, and enjoy the jokes in both.—Yours truly,

P. B. SPRING.

MELSON P.O., TALBOT CO., MD., Oct. 10, 1881.

Notes.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & Co. have in press the 'Charles Dickens Birthday Book,' being a selection of extracts and original designs by his daughter, Mrs. Perugini; 'The Honey-Ants of the Garden of the Gods, and the Occident Ants of the American Plains,' by Henry C. McCook,

D.D., who has already described the agricultural art of Texas; and 'Capturing a Locomotive,' an incident of the late war, by the Rev. Wm. Pittenger.—'A History of Rome for Young People,' by W. L. Alden, of the N. Y. Times.—'The American Citizen's Manual,' by A. Johnston, author of the 'History of American Politics'; and several novels—'Joseph's Coat,' by David Christie Murray, 'The Vicar's People,' by Geo. M. Fenn, and 'Esau Runswick,' by Katherine S. Macquoid—are announced as forthcoming by G. P. Putnam's Sons.—Mr. Hubert H. Bancroft, whose library of 35,000 volumes relating to the Pacific Coast has been lately transferred to a new fire-proof building, isolated from all others, on Valencia street, San Francisco, will begin publishing next year his 'History of the Pacific States,' including Central America, Mexico, New Mexico and Arizona, California, Utah and Nevada, Oregon, Washington Territory, Idaho and Montana, British Columbia, and Alaska.—Harper & Bros. will shortly have ready the 'Complete Works of Oliver Goldsmith,' in four volumes, edited by Peter Cunningham, and heretofore an exclusively British publication; and a 'History of Educational Theories,' by Oscar Browning.—We have the prospectus of the *Polaris*, "an undenominational, independent weekly journal of sixteen pages," to be published in Portland, Oregon. The singular name appears to have been determined by the fact that Lieut. F. G. Schwatka is among the contributors, and that he is an "Oregon Arctic explorer." This is honoring a prophet in his own country.—'Schwatka's Search: Sledging in the Arctic in Quest of the Franklin Records,' is the title of a work by W. H. Gilder, second in command, to be published by Charles Scribner's Sons.—The *Art Interchange* Publishing Co. has founded a monthly magazine, *Art-Work Manuals*, edited by Mr. Charles G. Leland. This title also is curious, but is explained by the fact that each number is devoted to a single topic, as, Ceramic Painting, Tapestry Painting, Wood Carving, Art Needlework, etc.—No. 12 of the *Bibliographical Contributions* of the Library of Harvard University is occupied with a list of the publications of the University and of its officers during the decade 1870-80. The arrangement of the second part is personal and alphabetical.—Three bulletins have just issued from the U. S. Entomological Commission at Washington, Nos. 4 and 5 being monographs on the Hessian Fly and on the Chinch-bug, by Prof. A. S. Packard, jr., and Dr. Cyrus Thomas, respectively, and having, among other illustrations, maps showing the range of these pests. No. 6 is a welcome and much-needed General Index and Supplement to the nine reports on the Insects of Missouri, by Dr. C. V. Riley. It embraces, besides the index proper, tables of contents to the several reports, errata, the description of new species and varieties, and sundry notes and additions.—The October number of the *Magazine of American History* is wholly devoted to Yorktown, with the usual supply of maps, portraits, and other engravings; and in the current issue of M. Jules Lévy's *Le Français* will be found a genealogical notice of 'Les Lafayette.'—In the same number of *Le Français* M. Alfred Mercier, of New Orleans, announces his intention to publish next month a romance entitled 'Les Saint-Ybars, ou Maitres et Esclaves en Louisiane,' which ought to furnish an interesting comparison with Mr. Cable's Creole tales.—A genealogical account of the Newhall Family, of Lynn, Mass., a prolific stock, is begun in Vol. xviii., Nos. 1, 2, 3, of the *Historical Collections* of the Essex Institute.—The Salmagundi Sketch Club will open its fourth annual exhibition of works of art in black and white at the

National Academy of Design on Dec. 2, for three weeks. Exhibitors must send their pieces to the rooms of the Club in University Building from Nov. 21 to Nov. 24.—Dietrich Reimer, Berlin, in addition to an earlier good-sized map of the Regency of Tunis, has just issued one on a smaller scale, but more comprehensive, as it embraces also Algeria. It is compiled by Dr. H. Kiepert, which is a guarantee of its being based on the latest and best authorities. B. Westermann & Co. are the American agents for it.

—Feuerbach's 'Essence of Christianity,' written in 1843, and translated in 1854 by George Eliot, then Miss Evans, which has been long out of print, is handsomely republished, without change, by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., in the "English and Foreign Philosophical Library." It is a work which has attracted great attention, and is devoted to the Left-Wing Hegelian or extreme Tübingen argument that Theology is really Anthropology, or that knowledge of God is at bottom self-knowledge. With great patristic learning and more ingenuity, the author seeks to show that the Church fathers shared his insight.—From the same publishing-house, and in the same series, the third and last volume of Lange's 'History of Materialism' has just appeared, six years after the author's death and the publication of the second, greatly revised, edition in German. Lange represents the critical, as Laas does the positivistic, side of the only current of German thought that has sought and found its way through and beyond current materialisms. The former does justice to his theme throughout the wide and diverse fields of physical, natural, ethical, and social science, with surprising knowledge and insight, only to show in the end the untenability of the materialistic hypothesis as commonly conceived. His work is by far the most important contribution yet made to the history of philosophic thought in our own time.—'Anim 1 Physiology,' for schools, is the title of a unique little book of 112 pages, by J. Milner Fothergill, M.D., just published by G. P. Putnam's Sons. Technical language is discarded, and the "story of the body" is admirably told for children of upper grammar-school grades and higher, with the aid of about sixty well-chosen woodcuts. In gathering this material from the wide fields of anatomy, histology, and hygiene, as well as physiology proper, the writer has shown both tact and knowledge. It is the best primer we have yet seen in this department, and should be the occasion of introducing this study far more widely into our public schools.—The same house has reprinted, in a shape that almost of itself compels reading, the remarkable 'Autobiography of Mark Rutherford, Dissenting Minister,' which was reviewed at some length in No. 831 of the *Nation*.—Björnson's delightful story of 'Arne' has been before the American public in a readable version for a dozen years, and is now retranslated by Prof. Anderson, in the complete edition of the author's works which he has undertaken (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.). A peculiarity in the present rendering is the reproduction of the interspersed songs in the metre and rhyme of the original; and Prof. Anderson hopes that those who admire them will be tempted to procure his 'Norway Music Album,' in which the music composed for them by Rikard Nordaak is given. It seems a pity that the melodies could not have accompanied the songs in this volume.—Charles Scribner's Sons have materially reduced the price of Mr. F. R. Stockton's 'Roundabout Rambles' and 'Tales Out of School,' two well-known illustrated children's books, among the very best of the class made up after the plates instead of before them, and full of humor, fancy, and instruction.

They have in press 'The Floating Prince, and Other Fairy Tales,' from the same pen.—The Ticknor & Fields illustrated edition of Thackeray's 'Ballads,' of 1835, has been enlarged beyond the author's original collection, and brought out anew by J. R. Osgood & Co. Time's marks on the stereotyped letter-press are compensated by an elaborate and tasteful binding. The first of these ballads, by the way, the stirring "Chronicle of the Drum," is being honored with a holiday edition by Chas. Scribner's Sons, with the aid of eminent designers and engravers.—Mr. Paul Barron Watson's 'Bibliography of the Pre-Columbian Discoveries of America,' already mentioned in these columns, has been reprinted in a thin quarto by the author, and may be procured of him at 30 Winslow St., Roxbury, Mass.—Harper & Bros. test the popular regard for the poetry of Byron by issuing in their Franklin Square Library the selection recently made by Mr. Matthew Arnold.—Mr. Leypoldt's 'Publishers' Trade-List Annual for 1881' has made its appearance, with the usual catalogues, classified summary, and annual reference-list—a store of bibliographic information.

—The "Committee on Appeal" have issued a circular address to the friends of Swarthmore College, lately destroyed by fire. They state neither the estimated loss nor the insurance on the building, which is to be immediately restored, while temporary arrangements have been made for continuing instruction at Media, two miles distant. They say, however, "a loss of twenty-five thousand dollars will probably be incurred in this year's business; that is, the unavoidable current expenses will, under the circumstances, probably exceed by that amount the current revenue of the year." The committee think that not only this should be met, but the unissued one hundred and sixty thousand dollars of the five hundred thousand dollars of authorized capital stock should be taken, and the endowment fund largely increased. Contributors will have the option of directing their money to the stock, the fund, or the current deficit; and subscriptions may either be paid in cash or in three monthly instalments. The treasurer is Robert Biddle, and checks to his order should be sent to Isaac H. Clothier, No. 801 Market street, Philadelphia, for George L. Maris, clerk of Committee on Appeal.

—Collectors have already begun to bind together the public prints relating to the assassination of President Garfield, and in company with them Mr. Moses King, of Cambridge, has gathered and issued in a thin pamphlet 'The Poets' Tributes to Garfield.' The basis of this collection is a "symposium" got up by the *Boston Globe*, to its own great satisfaction.

"Who could analyze all this? who could formulate a proper interpretation of the symbolic features of this terrible national affliction? Who but the poets? And so we went to the poets, and asked them individually and separately to pass this great mass of undefined sentiment through the crucible of song, and explain to the people the secret of their sorrow. They have done so. . . . The *Globe* has inaugurated a new departure in journalism. We think it will prove beneficial to the public and to the poets."

We have grave doubts as to the benefits of this sort of interviewing, and whatever may befall the public, the poets, we are sure, will suffer by the "new departure." So many great reputations have been damaged by falling—or, as in the case of poets-laureate, by being driven—into the pitfall of "occasional verse," that our native bards may well pray to be delivered from the added temptation of a sensational editor offering to put money in their purses. Both the dozen contributors to the *Globe* and the thirty-odd more spontaneous poets (English and American) whose productions have been subjoined by Mr.

King do nothing to enhance their reputations—where they had any. If we get what we might have expected from Donn Piatt, neither Dr. Holmes, nor Joaquin Miller, nor John Boyle O'Reilly, nor Julia Ward Howe, nor Charlotte Fiske Bates, nor Dr. J. G. Holland, nor Walt Whitman, nor the Harvard class poet, nor the London prize poet, gains by having spoken instead of keeping silent. Almost all the pieces err by being too long; the great majority are so vague as to fit almost any dead hero as well as Garfield, and the range of ideas is extremely limited. That never was there such universal mourning before; that the dead President was a self-made man; that he was a student and bookish; that his taking off unites North and South—these are the chief results of passing a "great mass of undefined sentiment through the crucible of song," and it cannot be said that plain people who have to converse in prose needed this enlightenment as to "the secret of their sorrow." A single poet, we observe, makes allusion to the connection between the President's death and an unreformed civil service. On the whole, we do not know that there is any better verse in this collection than that taken from *Puck*, unfavorable as the conditions may seem to have been; and we shall quote only from the stanzas of Mr. W. D. Kelly in the *Boston Pilot*, who should not be confounded with the great apostle of protection, though more about him we cannot premise:

"The South shall vie in praises with the North,
The East yield not in worship to the West,
But all alike pay homage to his worth
Who, if he failed in some things, stood the test
Of his last, greatest trial, and went forth
Out of his own land, mourned by all the rest."

—Mr. James Jackson, "archiviste bibliothécaire" of the Paris Geographical Society, has issued a new edition of his 'Liste provisoire de bibliographies géographiques spéciales,' increased by diligent researches in American libraries to 1,557 articles, the titles being given with absolute fulness, including even the number of pages, and the author indicates whether he has himself seen the books. (This has been the case with five-sixths of them.) The titles are arranged geographically, and provided with an index of authors, in which great pains have evidently been taken to obtain full Christian names; a list of periodicals; and a list of those works which another person might have classified differently from Mr. Jackson. And all these 340 pages are filled, not with a list of geographical works, but with a list of lists of geographical works! What is the (literary) world coming to? The multiplication of books, which such facts as these indicate, would not be of so much importance if we had as much storage-room as our fathers. But the Great American Desert is filling up, and Africa, which used to have inexhaustible empty space, is now found not to be hollow, and is, moreover, declared by the latest traveller to be "the coming continent." The Arctic and Antarctic regions will soon be the only places left capable of relieving the overflowing book-shelves of the twentieth century, if literature widens and the world narrows in their present increasing ratio.

—Dr. George Grove, who shares with Schumann the honor of having discovered and given to the world many important but forgotten manuscripts of Schubert, has published in the *London Daily News* a letter which seems to establish, on satisfactory evidence, that there must exist somewhere a tenth symphony by this composer; namely, the work which he dedicated in 1826 to the Musik-Verein of Vienna, and which has always been supposed to be the Symphony in C. The question can only be definitively decided by reference to the Society's ledger, where the 100 florins voted to Schubert on this occasion would naturally be entered. The year 1826 is that in which he composed the D minor and G major

quartets and the Fantasia Sonata in G, and the new symphony may be expected therefore to be of the same style and excellence as these works. "The B minor Symphony," Dr. Grove continues, "was hidden at Gratz unsuspected till long after his death. The oratorio of 'Lazarus' suddenly made its appearance in 1859, and the complete 'Rosamunde' music, a noble work, was dragged by Mr. Sullivan and myself out of a cupboard in Vienna in 1867 in a huge parcel, an inch thick in dust, which had apparently not been unpacked since the original performance in 1823. I make these facts public in the hope that they may attract the notice of the collectors and musicians of Vienna, who are more interested than any one else in recovering a possible masterpiece of one of their greatest composers."

—The fifty-fourth assembly of German Naturalists and Physicians at Salzburg opened on September 16 with an address by Professor Pettenkofer on the "Soil and its Relations to Health." The professor, who is perhaps the greatest living authority on what might be called meteorological hygiene, prefaced his remarks by saying that the first consideration of air, water, and soil in their sanitary relations dates as far back as Hippocrates—two thousand years ago; but hitherto our hygienic practices have been guided almost entirely by instinct and what is called common sense, and it is only recently that a scientific basis has been secured for them, chiefly through the germ theory of diseases. It has heretofore been assumed that the hygienic condition of the air deserved the first consideration, then that of the water, and finally that of the soil; but it now seems as if this order would have to be reversed. It has been found that there are some cities which enjoy a complete, or almost complete, immunity from certain epidemic diseases, such as cholera. Salzburg is one of these cities and Lyons another. Whenever the cholera makes its appearance in Paris or Marseilles the rich inhabitants go to Lyons, which, although it is situated just between these two centres of infection, remains intact. And it has been proved that this is not due to superior cleanliness, better water, or more favorable atmospheric conditions, as it is only some twenty years since the city was first supplied with filtered Rhone water, while the plateau of Languedoc is not protected, even by the frequent storms that visit it, from the disease. The average rate at which air moves is about three metres a second, and if this air contains in one locality noxious germs which it does not contain in another, they can only be derived from the soil. As the air moves along they disappear through diffusion or dilution just as, in the Seine, which is polluted by the sewage of Paris, no impurities whatever are found at Meulan, a few miles below Paris. As for the water, many cases of infection are known where its agency was strictly excluded, so that, although it would not do to pronounce dogmatically against the water-theory, it must be said that as yet it lacks cogent evidence.

—The influence of the soil in predisposing to disease is also strikingly shown on shipboard, where only those persons who come from certain localities are attacked; so that it is regarded as the best measure for the ship to cut off all communication with the shore at once by going to sea, where the disease as a rule soon disappears, because the ship in itself must be classed among those localities which do not spontaneously breed the disease. Experience has shown that alluvial soil is the favorite resort of certain infectious diseases. This is due to the fact that such soil is very porous and therefore contains a large amount of air, water, and organic material, which conduces to the rapid growth and multiplication of the microscopic bacteria whose introduction

in the human system gives rise to disease. The fact that large, heavy buildings are often erected on soil a third of whose volume consists of air, shows that the porosity of the soil is greater than is usually imagined. It shows also the importance of protecting houses from the poisonous germs which are bred in these pores of the soil. In winter and on many summer nights, when the air in our houses is warmer than the ground, the houses act like flues in sucking up the gases contained in it. Pettenkofer regards the system of canalization now adopted in most cities as an important safeguard against danger. The opponents of this system urge that the network of canals can never be made complete and absolutely free from leaks, so that the soil will always be polluted to some extent after all; but the answer to this objection is that so small an amount of pollution is neutralized by the activity of certain kinds of bacteria which act as a sort of scavenger in destroying the noxious bacteria. "These lowest representatives of organic life can therefore be made useful to us, too, and we must not be surprised if in future times the useful bacteria will be actually cultivated and only those that are noxious thwarted in their struggle for existence." This last sentence is the most striking one in the lecture, and one cannot help associating it with the prophecy uttered by Pasteur at the late Medical Congress at London, that the recent discovery that vaccination is useful in several infectious diseases besides smallpox points perhaps to a general law, by which the influence of one kind of microbe may be counteracted by that of another kind.

YORKTOWN.

The Yorktown Campaign and the Surrender of Cornwallis. By Henry P. Johnston. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1881. Large 8vo, pp. 206.

THE appearance of Mr. Johnston's monograph upon the Yorktown campaign and the surrender of Cornwallis is certainly opportune. Published in time for the Yorktown centennial, the work will materially aid in supplying the demand for information concerning the last act of our revolutionary drama. As in novel-reading, so in history, interest usually deepens towards the end of the tale. The *dénouement* at Yorktown will work more powerfully upon the imagination of students than does the formal opening of the plot in Independence Hall. Since the Philadelphia centennial, the history of the American Revolution has been in great part reconstructed. The articles of Mr. Stevens, and of his corps of contributors to the *Magazine of American History*, have placed many old battle-grounds of the Confederation in a much clearer light. Mr. Johnston's illustrated account of Yorktown, while representing his own extensive and original researches, is also the scientific combination of a host of detached studies.

The prelude to the concerted movement of Washington, De Grasse, and Rochambeau in October, 1781, was Lafayette's summer campaign in Virginia. This modern example of Fabian policy, exhibited by an enthusiastic, impulsive Frenchman, scarcely twenty-four years of age, who was matched by his Commander-in-Chief against England's ablest general, the Earl Cornwallis, then a man of forty-three, is graphically described by General Henry B. Carrington in the May number of Mr. Stevens's magazine, and also by Mr. Johnston in the third chapter of his 'Yorktown Campaign.' Lafayette had been sent to Virginia by Washington, with twelve hundred of his choicest Continentals, taken chiefly from New England regiments. With this detachment the glory-seeking La-

fayette was to oppose the inroads of Phillips and Arnold, who had been sent South by Sir Henry Clinton in order to divert Washington from New York to the defence of his own State, and also to support the operations of Cornwallis in North Carolina, where he was supposed to be out-generalling Greene, as he had done Gates at Camden. But the Earl was really doing nothing of the sort. In fact, he had rather the worst of it. Another such victory as that at Guilford Court House, said Fox in the House of Commons, would ruin the British army; and Cornwallis afterwards declared the contest in the Carolinas to be "impracticable against the rebellious inhabitants." He wrote to Phillips that he "was tired of marching about in search of adventures." He wanted to undertake more "solid operations" in Virginia, believing that, if that province could be secured through the aid of uprising Tories, the whole Southern section could be isolated from the final centre of operations about Philadelphia.

The germ of the method of conducting the Yorktown campaign may perhaps be found in Washington's scheme for Lafayette to beleaguer the forces of Arnold upon the shores of the Chesapeake, and, by co-operating with a French fleet, which was to be sent down from Newport under Destouches, to capture the traitor and his army. Arnold took up his position at Portsmouth; Lafayette was ordered to wait at the head of the Chesapeake until the fleet should sail into the bay. But before reaching its destination the French fleet encountered the English, and was so crippled that it was obliged to return to Newport. Thus the scheme of Washington at first miscarried, but in idea the proposed blockade of Portsmouth was a foreshadowing of the siege of Yorktown. Lafayette, with his detachment, was now recalled, but the order was soon countermanded, and he was instructed by Washington to push forward into Virginia and coöperate with Greene in the Southern campaign.

Lafayette, with his eight Massachusetts companies, marched from Baltimore on the 19th of April, 1781—a date already significant, and which has since become still more so in connection with that city. He had been fêted by society there and had obtained abundant supplies. Rich men like William Patterson, Charles Carroll, James McHenry, and others, advanced two thousand pounds to purchase summer clothing for his men. "The ladies of the city," says Johnston, "offered to make up the shirts and blouses for his soldiers." It would have been strictly accurate if he had said that they actually made the garments in question and sent them to the New England troops in Virginia. The practice of forwarding such supplies across the Potomac appears to have been revived during the late war by Baltimore ladies. Advancing towards Richmond by forced marches, Lafayette occupied the heights of that town upon the 29th of April, a few hours before the forces of Phillips came up. The latter thought it prudent to withdraw, and upon his death, which happened soon after, Arnold took command. By an arrangement preconceived with Phillips, Cornwallis formed a union of the British troops at Petersburg, when Arnold was sent back to New York. Johnston sharply defines the resultant situation: "Lafayette facing Cornwallis—a meagre, incomplete American force opposed to the British veterans of Camden and Guilford Court House, united with the strong detachments brought down by Arnold and Phillips. All eyes were now fixed upon this field, watching the development of the enemy's designs."

Cornwallis advanced upon Richmond. "Lafayette cannot escape him," wrote Clinton to the British ministry. From this expression, accord-

ing to Bancroft, has developed the saying accredited by all historians to Cornwallis, "The boy cannot escape me." It is to be observed that Mr. Johnston comes to the rescue of the old story by showing from a manuscript letter of a soldier of the period that, in camp, the noble Earl was reputed to have called the young Frenchman "an aspiring boy." But whatever Cornwallis said or thought, Lafayette eluded his adversary. The wary youth wrote to Washington, "Were I to fight a battle, I should be cut to pieces, the militia dispersed, and the arms lost. . . . I am therefore determined to skirmish." Cornwallis had under his command not far from seven thousand troops. At first, Lafayette had only his twelve hundred New Englanders; but these were soon joined by Steuben with a thousand militia from Virginia; a thousand more flocked over from Maryland; and Wayne, with eight hundred trained Continentals, came down from Pennsylvania, so that, in the end, Lafayette had under his orders about four thousand men. Having the sympathy of both Virginia and Maryland, this force was easily maintained, and it grew stronger every day under French and German discipline. Cornwallis, on the contrary, although he harried the Old Dominion, destroying three million dollars' worth of property, was constantly growing weaker, and was, moreover, losing his hold upon the Tories. Stealing race-horses and cutting the throats of fine colts was no way to retain the affections of Virginians. The only brilliant British exploit in the entire campaign was Tarleton's raid upon Charlottesville, then the seat of the Virginia Assembly. With two hundred and fifty troopers mounted upon Virginia horses, he rode seventy miles in twenty-four hours, and would have surprised and captured the leading politicians of the State, together with Governor Jefferson at Monticello, if it had not been for a faster rider, Captain John Jouett, the Paul Revere of the South, who reached Charlottesville before Tarleton and gave warning to the town.

As midsummer approached, Cornwallis began to move down the York peninsula towards the sea. Probably, as in North Carolina, he had again become tired of marching about in search of adventures, and possibly, like Lord Beaconsfield, he was also tired of atrocities. Lafayette and his light infantry hung now upon the flanks of the retreating enemy. "I had an eye upon European negotiations," wrote the wily Frenchman, "and made it a point to give his Lordship the disgrace of a retreat." In the early part of August, the British forces appeared at Yorktown and began to fortify that place, together with Gloucester, upon the opposite side of the York River, in order to secure a good naval station for English vessels, which Cornwallis had every reason to expect would support him as they had supported Arnold at Portsmouth. With adequate naval coöperation, Cornwallis would have been entirely safe at Yorktown. The responsibility for his capture lay in the inefficient management of the English fleet, which was divided in the pursuit of small ends, when it ought to have been united in repelling De Grasse. Clinton afterwards charged Cornwallis with violating instructions in not occupying Old Point Comfort as well as Yorktown, and Johnston intimates that the Earl might perhaps have escaped the toils that were gathering around him by crossing over to Portsmouth as soon as he heard of the arrival of the French fleet. But without the support of English ships, even this step would not have saved Cornwallis, for he might have been shut up in Portsmouth according to the original plan for entrapping Arnold. The whole issue turned upon the presence and superiority of the French fleet at the right moment.

Washington's sudden change of base from New York to Yorktown was a master-stroke of military genius. The movement was a total surprise to both Cornwallis and Clinton, and it brought disaster and ruin to the British cause. The swift combination of the American forces about Yorktown and their co-operation with the fleet of De Grasse, which came up the Chesapeake from the West Indies, decided the success of the American Revolution. The origin of this brilliant strategy has been disputed. Mr. Stevens, in the *Magazine of American History* for January, 1880, says: "It is to Rochambeau himself as the author of the campaign that the chief honors are due. It was his advice that directed De Grasse to the Chesapeake, his request that brought reinforcements from the West Indies to assist in the siege of Yorktown." There is no better chapter in Mr. Johnston's monograph than that in which he essays to prove that the Yorktown campaign was not the inspiration of any one man, but "a development" conditioned by circumstances. It had been agreed in May at the Wethersfield conference between Washington and Rochambeau, as the former told Greene, "to make an attempt upon New York, with its present garrison, in preference to a Southern operation, as we had not the decided command of the water." If, at the time Cornwallis first invaded Virginia, Washington had been confident of naval superiority over the English, there can be little doubt that his plan of operations would have turned southward. During the early summer he was in constant receipt of letters from Jefferson and Lee, urging him to come home and defend Virginia. But Washington understood well that by threatening New York with his Continentals in conjunction with the French forces from Newport under Rochambeau, he should either capture the city or divert a portion of the British troops from the South, and thus ensure American victory there. Johnston quotes a letter from Washington to Lafayette, dated July 30, showing that the Commander-in-Chief was even then preparing to coöperate, if necessary, in the Southern campaign:

"From a change of circumstances with which the removal of part of the enemy's force from Virginia to New York will be attended, it is more than probable that we shall also entirely change our plan of operations. I think we have already effected one part of the plan of campaign settled at Wethersfield; that is, giving a substantial relief to the Southern States by obliging the enemy to recall a considerable part of their force from thence. Our views must now be turned towards endeavoring to expel them totally from those States, if we find ourselves incompetent to the siege of New York."

Early in August, we find Washington making enquiries of Robert Morris as to means of transportation from Philadelphia southward. And here it may be remarked that without the energetic financial policy of this new treasurer, who not only secured transportation, but supplies and hard cash for the dispirited troops, probably Yorktown would never have been won. There are too many factors in the successful conduct of any campaign to justify a monopoly of merit for any one leader. The beauty of the Yorktown campaign lies in the coöperation of allied forces and the concurrence of many events. To regard Washington or Rochambeau as the sole author of it, is a one-sided view. To be sure, the latter was the man who recommended De Grasse "to enter the Chesapeake on his way, as there might be an opportunity of striking an important stroke there," but this suggestion was entirely in harmony with the plan of operations agreed upon by Washington and Rochambeau. To assume in any way the direction of an American campaign was contrary to the French method of procedure, as was evinced at Yorktown. The probable truth is that Washington, Rochambeau, and De

Grasse acted with as perfect an understanding as was possible under the circumstances. Washington afterwards wrote:

"A combined operation of the land and naval forces of France and America for the year 1781 was preconcerted the year before. The point of attack was not absolutely agreed upon, because it would be easy for the Count de Grasse, in good time before his departure from the West Indies, to give notice by express at what place he could most conveniently touch to receive advice; and because it could not be foreknown where the enemy would be most susceptible of impression, and because we, having command of the water, with sufficient means of conveyance, could transport ourselves to any spot with the greatest celerity."

There can be little doubt that Washington himself preferred on the whole a combined attack upon New York, but he distinctly asserts that he would never have attempted it unless success had appeared "infallible." He had long been watching for "some splendid advantage," either in the North or at the South, and when he learned that the Count de Grasse was on his way to the Chesapeake and could only remain upon the coast a short time, he renounced all idea of attacking New York, and determined to remove his forces to Virginia with all possible secrecy and despatch. Not even his own soldiers knew of their destination at the outset, and all pains were taken to deceive Sir Henry Clinton. In view of securing "some splendid advantage" in the South, it is possible that Washington concealed the knowledge of this alternative scheme even from his best friends and highest officers. Perhaps it was known at first only to Rochambeau. Johnston might have strengthened his position in regard to this alternative plan by quoting the following passage from one of Washington's letters: "It was determined by me nearly twelve months beforehand, at all hazards, to give out and cause it to be believed by the highest military as well as civil officers, that New York was the destined place of attack, for the important purpose of inducing the Eastern and Middle States to make greater exertions in furnishing specie supplies than otherwise would have been done, as well as for the interesting purpose of rendering the enemy less prepared elsewhere." Undoubtedly Washington was determined by the force of circumstances to revert to his long-cherished plan of entrapping the enemy upon the Chesapeake by a combination of forces on land and sea, as in the scheme against Arnold, upon which sufficient stress has never been laid by the historians. The point to observe in Mr. Johnston's account of the genesis of the Yorktown campaign is that Washington was perfectly prepared for a movement southward, and realized that with a superior fleet victory was a foregone conclusion.

The story of the march of the allies southward has been minutely described by Mr. Stevens and Mr. Johnston, and need not be repeated here. Into the military details of the Yorktown siege, into an enumeration of forces, commanders, and ships, into an account of Cornwallis's surrender the reader can enter with the assurance of fullest detail by perusing Mr. Johnston's interesting monograph. Never before has the story been so well told. The work contains excellent maps, plans of the siege, portraits of the leaders, extracts from Washington's journal, and other contemporary sources of information. With such an historical field-glass the student can review, from a safe and comfortable distance, the operations which went on in that Yorktown peninsula, where a great host of sight-seers is now gathering, and where the descendants of Rochambeau, Lafayette, and Steuben, representatives of France and Germany, will soon visit together the field where American independence was won.

This concourse of peaceful citizens and foreign envoys, conveying expressions of international good-will, signalizes a greater victory than that gained in 1781 by the combined armies of France and America, and by the military science of Germany displayed by Steuben in the conduct of the siege. A recent utterance in the *London Times* indicates how fully the descendants of the defeated are united with us in sentiment: "We have quite as much reason as the Americans to share in their centenary thanksgiving." It is noteworthy that three of the most prominent nationalities in modern Europe were engaged, with the united colonies of America, in that *Voelkerschlacht* at Yorktown. France was there arrayed against England; and the Germans were there, although divided against themselves. These three nations, together with America, have decided four of the most important battles that have been fought during the last hundred years. Yorktown, Waterloo, Sedawa, and Sedan constitute an historical quadrilateral, forming with their diplomatic results the ramparts of the nineteenth century.

PARTON'S LIFE OF VOLTAIRE.—II.

Life of Voltaire. By James Parton. 2 vols. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

MOZART wrote to his father on the 3d of July, 1778: "I must give you a piece of intelligence which you perhaps already know, namely, that the ungodly arch-villain Voltaire has died miserably, like a dog—just like a brute. That is his reward." Howard, the philanthropist, thus expressed himself a few years earlier: "I returned to Geneva. There are some exemplary persons; yet the principles of one of the vilest of men, Voltaire, with the corruptions of the French who are within a mile of the city, have greatly debased its ancient purity and splendor." When Boswell told Johnson that he had visited and was pleased with Rousseau, the English moralist roared out: "Rousseau, sir, is a very bad man. I would sign a sentence for his transportation sooner than that of any fellow who has gone from the Old Bailey these many years." When Boswell asked: "Sir, do you think him as bad a man as Voltaire?" Johnson replied: "Why, sir, it is difficult to settle the proportion of iniquity between them."

Here we have four samples of the sentiments with which a large proportion of the European world regarded Voltaire during his life and after his death. Nor can it be denied that in England and America at least the feeling of abhorrence for the great French freethinker survives among large classes even unto the present day. Yet any one who candidly and with an open mind considers the details of Voltaire's life, as they are laid before the public with unsparring minuteness by Mr. Parton, will, in our judgment, of necessity come to the conclusion that whatever be the estimate which mankind may ultimately form of Voltaire, the idea that he was "a brute," the "vilest of men," a thoroughly "bad man," a person whose life was steeped in "iniquity," prevalent though it has been, and still in many quarters may be, is one of the strangest, though not the most unaccountable, historical misconceptions begotten by theological hatred. For though no one can for a moment maintain that Voltaire's life and career has not its bad, and even its very bad, sides, it is perfectly futile, in the face of patent facts, to deny that it has also a very brilliant and good side, or to overlook the fact that his existence was in the main a continuous struggle in favor of what he held to be truth, justice, and humanity, and that his foes were, at least as often as not, the opponents of what every man of sense now holds to have been the cause of right and of equity. It were in-

deed, as has been before this pointed out, equally easy and equally useless to make Voltaire the subject of vehement invective or of unmeasured eulogy. There are aspects of his career which lend themselves easily to either purpose. It is a better expenditure of time to take the information presented to us by Mr. Parton, and attempt to ascertain from Voltaire's own life what are the causes which make it difficult for Englishmen to form a fair estimate, either for good or bad, of a thinker whose character was more distinctly un-English than that of any literary man who has attained world-wide influence and renown.

"In Voltaire," writes Goethe, "nature produced a man most eminently endowed with all the qualities which characterize and honor his nation, and charged him to represent France to the universe." This dictum admirably sums up the nature of Voltaire's talents, but it also suggests the reflection that his genius was in a very singular way national rather than universal. You cannot read a line of Voltaire's without remembering that he was a Frenchman, and a Frenchman of the eighteenth century. And a great deal which is incomprehensible to Englishmen arises from the whole of Voltaire's taste and sentiment being essentially French. It is sometimes almost impossible for a modern English or American reader to believe that a light, scoffing, irreverent writer could have written with a real, serious purpose. Pope perhaps is, at his best, as light and witty as Voltaire; but Pope, though he struck sharp enough blows against literary incompetence, cannot be credited with a very serious purpose. Swift offends against our modern ideas of decency and reverence, but Swift's savage and morose humor, just because it is savage and morose, seems to Englishmen akin to earnestness. The feature in Voltaire's character which it is hard for us to understand is the combination of a light, scoffing, flippant mode of expression, thought, and feeling, with the most vehement earnestness in waging war on what he held to be oppression or prejudice.

To call Voltaire a "bad man" in the sense in which Rousseau might assuredly be called "bad," were it not for the doubt whether he was not to a certain extent mad, is an abuse of terms. But there is no denying that Voltaire's language and conduct often justified the severest reprobation. The committee of admirers who, on the centenary of his death, published a cheap collection of the most typical of his works, have given but very sparing extracts from the 'Pucelle,' and one may presume that there are few of Voltaire's admirers prepared to defend the tone and language of this poem or of many others of his writings which, like the 'Pucelle,' gave keen delight in Voltaire's day, not only to his disciples, but to the whole of good society in France. The whole of his relation, again, to Madame du Châtelet, though not morally more blameworthy than many connections between celebrated men and women which have escaped severe censure, is almost incomprehensible to modern students. How the Marquis, Madame, Voltaire, and finally Saint-Lambert, could live together on good terms, and how the Marquis, without being hopelessly disgraced, could accept before and after his wife's death pecuniary benefits from the poet, are problems which, if they can be answered at all, can be solved only by studying and realizing in one's imagination the moral or immoral condition of French society in Church and State during the reign of Louis XV. Nor are Voltaire's private irregularities the only blemishes in his character which rightly offend modern critics. His training under the Jesuits was, as has been constantly noted, not without its effect. He of set purpose turned their own arms against

the priesthood. To equivocate, to pretend, to lie, cost him nothing. He had imbibed from his generation and from his teachers the notion that to lie for what he considered a good end was, to say the least, a harmless act, and that a wise man, while warring with prejudice to the death, should never be such a fool as to let himself be made a martyr rather than apparently conform to the foolish and superstitious practices enjoined by men in power. Voltaire must, indeed, in fairness be acquitted of all hypocrisy. When he dedicated 'Mahomet' to the Pope; when he "communed," as Mr. Parton has it, at Ferney; when he "confessed his sins" on his death-bed, he assuredly neither deceived, nor meant to deceive, any one: in the first instance, he meant to obtain a patron; in the second, he apparently wished to throw derision on the ceremonies of the Church; and in the last, only aimed at securing a peaceable and decent burial, though why he should have cared so much to be buried in sacred ground is one of those matters which an Englishman and a Protestant finds it very hard to understand. The real and valid charge against Voltaire is not that he was a hypocrite, but that he fatally discouraged that system of open protest against all religious acts in which a man does not believe, which in the long run is the only effective mode of attacking falsehood or of establishing truth. Voltaire was not a Christian, but his Catholic education had completely guarded against his becoming in any sense a Protestant. The avenger of Calas never understood the principle which had kept Calas and his family from conforming to Catholicism.

Voltaire's own faults or vices have obscured the better side of his character and of his influence; his reputation has also suffered in the nineteenth century from two misconceptions for which he is not responsible. The follies, the errors, and the crimes of the Revolution have been charged by English writers to the *Philosophes*, and especially to their leader. Now in this matter, as regards Voltaire, at any rate, a double injustice is committed. The moral corruption of the *ancien régime* was no doubt, in a great measure, the source of the Revolutionary horrors, but the social maladies under which France labored existed when Voltaire was born, and were at least as much mitigated as aggravated by his teaching. The cruelties of the Reign of Terror were the direct fruit of the savage system of criminal law which had long disgraced France. It is ridiculous to attribute them to the man who had labored through life for the reform of criminal procedure and the abolition of torture. The speculative mistakes which contributed to grave practical errors were for the most part the mistakes, not of Voltaire, but of Rousseau. The absurd worship of nature is certainly not a doctrine to be learnt from the author of 'Candide,' or from the teacher who, from the very first, exposed and derided Rousseau's fallacies; the worship of "the people" was assuredly not a lesson taught by a man who lived on intimacy with monarchs, and looked for reform rather to the influence of an enlightened despot than to the efforts of democratic leaders. The contempt for political experience was not due to the teaching of the writer who first forced Frenchmen to turn their minds to the lessons to be learnt from the laws and the philosophy of England. Voltaire, further, was the consistent foe of war and violence. One of the misfortunes of France was that, politically, the theories of Voltaire did not obtain predominant influence. Neither Robespierre nor Napoleon was a disciple of the patriarch of Ferney.

The error which ascribes to Voltaire moral responsibility for the calamities of the Revolution is far less serious than the misunderstanding of the real nature of the contest which made up

the serious business of his life. Whoever wishes to understand the scope of Voltaire's efforts should read with care Mr. Parton's excellent chapters on "*Écrasez l'Infâme*," "The Provocation," "The Calas Tragedy," and "Ferney a Refuge for the Oppressed."

"The *Infâme* which Voltaire had in his mind was religion claiming supernatural authority, and employing it to enforce the claim, the power, and resources of Government. It was religion with the Bastille and the rack at its command. It was religion owning two acres of every five in France—usually the best two—and able to expel from the other three the noblest Frenchmen who called in question its tenets. . . . It was religion killing religion, and making virtue itself contemptible by resting its claim on grounds untenable and ridiculous. It was religion wielding the whole mass of indolence, ignorance, and cowardice, and placing it, solid and entire, in the only path by which the human race could advance. It was the worst thing that ever was in the world. It was *l'Infâme*."

This passage, extracted with curtailment from Mr. Parton's book, expresses as nearly as can be expressed the spirit to which Voltaire was opposed. It cannot, of course, for a moment be concealed that he clearly believed that all religious dogmatism was likely to beget persecution; that he disbelieved and derided beliefs which all Christians respect, together with a host of beliefs which were in his time thought essential parts of Christianity, but which to-day are practically given up by men who would indignantly deny the charge of not being Christians. But the feeling which roused Voltaire to battle—a sentiment which clearly increased in intensity as his life advanced and as his character manifestly gained in weight and depth—was intense indignation at every form of theological persecution. To understand the vehemence of this ruling passion, one must remember that Voltaire was born within forty years of the close of the Thirty Years' War; that the revocation of the Edict of Nantes was at his time no distant event; that the insurrection in the Cévennes took place in his lifetime; that look where he would he saw traces of the misery brought on mankind by religious fervor or intolerance; and that, when an old man, he was roused to indignation as virtuous as it was just by some of the most outrageous acts of iniquity, inspired for the most part by theological prejudice, which the world has witnessed. The names of Calas, of Espinasse, of De la Barre, are each enough to recall the transactions which kindled his righteous indignation. It must, further, be remembered that he was a man to whom injustice of all kinds, even when absolutely unconnected with any theological question, as in the case of Lally-Tollendal, was absolutely hateful, and that he was one to whom no victim of oppression ever appealed in vain, and who never spared money, time, or labor in the effort to obtain justice for the oppressed. When all this is borne in mind, even the "*Écrasez l'Infâme*" has a very different effect from that which it generally produces on the feelings of Englishmen.

But he erred at any rate, it will be said, in supposing that religious intolerance was the peril of the day. In some degree this, no doubt, is true. Men's principles and sentiments are formed in youth, while no one can give effect to his principles till he has reached maturity, it may be advanced, age. Hence it is the constant mistake of teachers, no less than of statesmen, to combat the dangers which are past while overlooking the perils of the present or the future. Few are the warriors of politics or literature who have not wasted their strength in slaying the slain. Some of Voltaire's friends thought that he too wasted the last efforts of his life in a war with ghosts. In one house where he called during his last visit to Paris, "the mistress re-

proached him for the obstinacy with which he continued to assail the Church and its beliefs. 'Be moderate and generous,' said she, 'after the victory! What can you fear at present from such adversaries? The fanatics are prostrate [*à terre*]; they can no longer injure; their reign is past.'" To these words, softly spoken by the lady, herself not long to live, he replied:

"You are in error, madame; it is a fire that is covered, not extinguished. Those fanatics, those Tartuffes, are mad dogs. They are muzzled, but they have not lost their teeth. It is true, they bite no more; but on the first opportunity, if their teeth are not drawn, you will see if they will not bite!"

Was Voltaire's judgment right? Most persons will answer in the negative; but there are one or two facts deserving consideration before one makes a decided reply. Louis XVI. was on the throne, and not yet under any fear of the Revolution. Yet at the moment when Voltaire spoke he was liable to be banished without trial from Paris, and his banishment was half threatened by the King. Voltaire died in the midst of such an ovation as has never been received before or since by any man of letters, yet his death remained for weeks a secret, because the Government forbade the publication of the fact. France was not yet under the rule of law; persecutors might at any moment have become supreme. In 1791 Voltaire's bones were publicly buried in the Pantheon. In May, 1814, the priesthood had such influence that the bones of Voltaire and of Rousseau were taken by night out of their coffins to a piece of waste ground and dropped into a pit filled with quicklime. This outrage on the feeling of the French nation—for it can be called nothing less—was carried out under the orders of the Government, and kept secret till 1864. No one after this will undertake to assert either that the spite or that the power of the priesthood in France is even yet at an end. Voltaire was at least right in believing that his foes would still bite if they could. Meanwhile every critic, of whatever school, who wishes to understand Voltaire, should make it his first study to understand the nature and power of that spirit of theological intolerance of which Voltaire was the untiring and, frequently enough, unscrupulous foe.

BOOKS ABOUT THE STAGE.

Edwin Forrest. By Lawrence Barrett. With Illustrations. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1881. Pp. 171. [American Actor Series.]

The World Behind the Scenes. By Percy Fitzgerald. London: Chatto & Windus; New York: Scribner & Welford. 1881. Pp. 330. [Wanderer's Library.]

Original Plays. By W. S. Gilbert. Second Series. London: Chatto & Windus; New York: Scribner & Welford. 1881. Pp. 338. [Mayfair Library.]

Recollections of an Equestrian Manager. By Charles W. Montague. Edinburgh and London: W. & R. Chambers. 1881. Pp. 108.

Cornebois. Par Edgar Monteil. Paris: Charpentier; New York: F. W. Christern. 1881. Pp. 344.

In these days of brief biographies, it was high time that there should be a series of lives of eminent actors and actresses. In the English "*Men of Letters*," and in "*Ancient*" and "*Foreign Classics for English Readers*," the dramatists have had their full share of attention, and there are rival series of biographies of philosophers, of musicians, and of painters. It is not a little odd that we should have had to wait thus long for a series of histrionic biographies, especially when

we remember that from the 'Apology' of Colley Cibber to the 'Reminiscences' of Macready the autobiographies of actors have been among the most entertaining specimens of that always interesting department of literature. The "American Actor Series," of which the first volume has now made its appearance, is edited by Mr. Laurence Hutton, author of a pleasantly-written book on the 'Plays and Players' of New York. The series is to contain volumes on the Jeffersons and on the Wallacks, by Mr. William Winter; on the Booths, by Mrs. Asia Booth Clarke (who has already written a book about her father); on Charlotte Cushman, by Mrs. Clement; and on Mrs. Duff and her contemporaries, by Mr. Ireland. Other volumes are in preparation, including one on Charles Fechter, by Miss Kate Field. Fechter has no more right to be ranked as an American actor than George Frederick Cooke, who likewise came here to act for a while, and then to die here before his time; and he has surely less title to a place in this series than Thomas Abthorpe Cooper, the pupil of William Godwin, who, though an Englishman by birth, was the first of American actors, being criticised as an American when he returned to play a short engagement in London. It was on Cooper that Edwin Forrest at first founded his style, and one may doubt whether the pupil ever surpassed his early master. No book about Cooper is as yet announced in the present series, which begins with one about Forrest, written by Mr. Lawrence Barrett.

While nothing is more common than an actor's writing a book about himself, scarcely anything is less common than an actor's writing a book about another actor. Tom Davies, to be sure, wrote a life of David Garrick; but Davies was rather an author and publisher than an actor. Indeed, the only other precedent we can recall now is to be found in the collection of "Mémoires sur l'Art Dramatique," published in Paris fifty years ago. It was for this collection that Adolphe Thiers wrote an essay on the life of George Anne Bellamy, a notorious stage beauty of the last century, to precede a translation of the autobiography she had written or had had written for her. Now, in this same collection are the memoirs of Lekain, preceded by "Quelques Reflexions sur Lekain et sur l'Art Théâtral," by Talma, who was Lekain's successor as the chief tragic actor of the Comédie-Française; and even this essay of Talma's is more in the nature of a preface than a biographical sketch like Mr. Barrett's. The life of Forrest was already a twice-told tale; but Mr. Barrett's book is in many respects better than either of its predecessors. It is in every way superior to the rhapsodic eulogy of Mr. James Rees, and it is simpler and, on the whole, more satisfactory than the two ponderous tomes of the Rev. W. R. Alger. Perhaps the first impression one gets from it is that it is an honest performance. The author has a high opinion of Forrest's abilities, and not a low opinion of his character; but he supplies frankly and freely abundant material for the correction of his own judgment. In pages 130-139 Mr. Barrett quotes at length the diverging opinions of Forrest expressed at various times by Macready, Douglas Jerrold, H. F. Chorley, James E. Murdoch, Charles T. Congdon, Wm. B. Maclay, F. C. Wemyss (in his 'Theatrical Biography'), and H. P. Phelps (in his 'Players of a Century'). In narrating the incidents of Forrest's theatrical career, and in considering the awkward facts of the riot and the divorce, Mr. Barrett sets down nothing in malice, nor does he extenuate more than is any biographer's right. He treats the divorce with praiseworthy reserve, and in the account of the Astor Place riot there is no attempt to disguise Forrest's mistakes in taste, if

in nothing else. It is to be regretted that the files of the *Examiner* were not searched to see exactly what basis there was for Forrest's accusation that John Forster, as a friend of Macready's, had attacked the American actor "even before" he "had appeared on the London boards, and continued to abuse" him "at every opportunity afterwards" (p. 69).

Altogether, this recital is interesting and very instructive, particularly in regard to the progress in civilization made in these States since Forrest first came on the stage. Indeed, we doubt whether a career like his is now possible, and we are sure that a character like his would now have a wholly different discipline and development. Mr. Barrett's inexperience as a writer is to be detected occasionally, but the main story is, with here and there a little misplaced rhetoric, told in a straightforward and manly fashion. There is an ample and admirable index of nearly thirteen pages, and there are seven illustrations, consisting of portraits of Forrest at twenty-one, at forty-five, and at sixty-five respectively, and of Mrs. Forrest, a view of Fonthill, and fac-similes of a letter and of a London play-bill. The book worthily begins the series.

Mr. Percy Fitzgerald is an industrious compiler, to whom we owe eight or nine volumes about the drama, including a discreditable 'Romance of the English Stage' and an inadequate 'Life of David Garrick.' The latest, cited above, is a queer hodge-podge. Although the author does not inform us, most of the matter has already appeared in various periodicals. We recognize, for instance, parts of a series of papers published in the *Art Journal* on the arrangement of theatres, and others published elsewhere on stage-mechanism and illusions, and on the Charles Mathews pictures now owned by the Garrick Club. The nominal classification into five parts is of little or no assistance, as any one can see by considering the table of contents: I. Stage Illusions—Mechanism; II. Spectacles, Féeries, etc.; III. The Actors: their Lives, Tastes, and Accomplishments; IV. Theatres: the Grand Opera at Paris and other Houses; V. Authors. This last division, comically enough, consists of twenty-two pages on the plays written by Charles Dickens or adapted from his novels, two and a half pages on dramatic criticism in London, and a list of English adaptations from the French, so full of errors of omission and commission as to be almost valueless. It is introduced by a remark that at this moment the English stage is virtually subsisting on the French, the fact being that there is more original work done now on the English stage than at any time during the past thirty years. "What a contrast this," exclaims Mr. Fitzgerald, "to the old days of exuberant native production, when Dibdin, dying so lately as 1841, was stated to be the author of two hundred pieces, and Mr. Planché of over one hundred." From this we may fairly infer that Mr. Fitzgerald does not know that nearly all Dibdin's pieces were adaptations either from English novels or from French and German plays. As for Planché's hundred plays, we question if a score of them were original in any exact sense of the word.

As though to bear witness against Mr. Fitzgerald, the most popular of English dramatists has put forth a second volume of original plays. It contains "Broken Hearts," a somewhat slight fairy comedy in blank verse not unlike the "Wicked World" in the preceding series; "Engaged," "Sweethearts," and "Dan'l Druce," all familiar to our playgoers; "Gretchen," a reworking of the Faust legend, with omission of the poetry; "Tom Cobb," a burlesque comedy of the "Engaged" type; and three operettas,

"The Sorcerer," "H. M. S. Pinafore," and "The Pirates of Penzance." All these nine plays, including comedy, farce, drama, and comic opera, have been acted, more than half of them with great success; and all are original save the obligation of "Gretchen" to Goethe, and the equally acknowledged borrowing of an incident in "Dan'l Druce" from "Silas Marner." To our mind, "Sweethearts" easily holds the first place among these various attempts, and we should not be at all surprised if it should prove to be the one English play written in the last decade destined to survive the century.

Books about the circus are rare. When one notes Frost's 'Circus Life and Circus Celebrities,' just reprinted in the "Wanderer's Library," and the life of old Astley, and Dickens's 'Hard Times,' and Goncourt's 'Frères Zemganno,' and one of Albert Smith's novels, one has well nigh exhausted the list. Mr. Montague's 'Recollections' have already appeared, if we mistake not, in *Chambers's Journal*. They contain not a few amusing anecdotes of circus life in England—a very different thing from circus life here in America, where the national fondness for a "big thing" has delighted in expanding the legitimate show. The book is written in an easy and unpretending manner.

To those who know anything of French theatrical life, and desire to know more, M. Montell's 'Cornebois' can be recommended. It is an amusing book in itself—a little boisterous at times, not to say coarse; and it gives a truthful picture of the French actor, as he fights his way through the Conservatory to the Théâtre Français. It may be as well to say that it is not intended for young ladies, although it is not tainted with the "naturalism" now prevalent in French fiction.

The Wandering Jew. By M. D. Conway. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1881. Pp. 292.

It seems to have been quite as hard for mankind before clear notions of a future life had arisen, or science had assumed the persistence of force, to conceive of an absolute beginning or end of life as it is now for us. The gradual unfolding of living organisms, and now Evolution, help us out in the attempt to comprehend origins; but the abrupt, absolute fact of death, especially of friends or heroes, is essentially inconceivable. The instinctive belief was first, according to Mr. Conway, in an earthly immortality, and found expression in the myths of sleep prolonged perhaps for generations, of transmigration, of trance, of secret removal to distant lands (like the stars above), of prolonged pilgrimage, or of the great age ascribed to Antediluvian patriarchs. From these grew the earlier forms of belief in the life after death, while the numbers for whom immortality was claimed grew, and paradise necessarily ascended to an aerial realm. Survivals of this primitive stage, perhaps of widely different ethnic origin, abound and illustrate what is more fully expressed in the legend of the Wandering Jew. Myths as diverse as The Wild Huntsman, King Arthur, Rip van Winkle, Teiresias, Yima, as well as the stories of Cain, Seth, Enoch, the transfigured Elias, John who was to "tarry" till Christ came again, and probably even Shylock and Punch and Judy, and countless others, "exchanged connotations" with the tale of Ahasuerus, until the latter gradually became a popular type of the fate of the Jewish race, and after its dispersion the Eternal Jew became the Wandering Jew. Nearly a score of writers in Germany alone have given the theme a more or less detailed literary treatment, and it seems to have been one of the most popular "mythic forms" in the folk-lore of all times and countries. Ahasuerus is repre-

sented now as vainly seeking every conceivable form of death, now as a philosophizing pessimist, now as a penitent whose pardon had been long delayed, but came at last. Now he symbolizes humanity unconsciously opposing itself to God, but doomed to endure till submission to Christ is complete; again, he is immortal man, in whose unbroken consciousness all history is embodied, a conception expressed in such phrases as "Ancient of Days," "Son of Man," etc. Mosen's poem represents the wanderer as a hero of humanity, warring against Christ at the head of Mohammed's troops; Köhler's Jew is a prophet of freedom; Klingemann finds purification by suffering to be the lesson taught; Anderson preaches the restlessness of doubt and unbelief; Heller puts the hero through many phases of Hegel's phenomenology: the intellectual world ever decays, consumed by doubt, and the heart ever brings it forth anew. Quinet, we are told, wrote his Ahasuerus on foot, on horseback, in the gondola, at sea, etc., as he was travelling in despairing search after a lost faith, typifying his hero, as he thought, and using motives from Faust. Eugene Sue's Jew is the workman sentenced to drudgery, and finding at last relief. But it is Shelley's Ahasuerus, the author tells us, who is dignified beyond all others, because he defies the divine tyrant with true Promethean vigor. Although the Jew had "arisen as a spiritual type before nearly every fine mind living at the beginning of the last generation," only Shelley made a real hero of the Wanderer for his scorn and defiance of the Christian deity.

Mr. Conway prefers to regard the hero of all these tales as a type of the Jewish race, and in the last chapters enlarges on the German persecutions, although, it must be said, in a rather incoherent way. He divides the blame with great impartiality between Christian and Jew. These persecutions are denounced as unreasonable bigotry, but it is urged that the Christian has learned his intolerance from the Jew. The Hebrews of the Old Testament slew the Canaanites and Baalites, imagining themselves the "chosen" people, and their laws and institutions divinely revealed. In persecuting the Jews, Christians are only practising what is taught them by Jewish precept and example. The great error, however, is that the Jews insist upon keeping their "small provinces of mouldered faith," "seek strength and happiness in isolation, and are withheld by their traditional system and dogmas from co-operation with mankind in its nobler aims and tendencies. So

long as they are marked off in the human world in this way they will not find rest." Their religion is more narrowing than Christianity only because it is intensified by racial instincts and prejudices.

Here, but for what is implied in this latter clause, we must dissent from the author. Indeed, it seems doubtful if the religious question is now in any way involved in the German issue. The question there, however, does seem to be becoming central whether the Jews are as public-spirited, as ready to coöperate in mankind's nobler and more unselfish aims and tendencies, as others; or whether, on the other hand, they are materializing, or, in Du Bois-Reymond's intolerable phrase, "Americanizing" German society and life. This is a fair question respecting any class of citizens, provided it could be raised without degenerating into vulgar passions of race or creed. It is significant that Dr. Felix Adler, whose radicalism is as obnoxious to the orthodox Jew as is Mr. Conway's to the orthodox Christian, has condemned the *auri sacra fames* as very few clergymen in any Christian denomination would have the courage to do. Whether this argues more fearlessness on his part or more occasion, we will not even conjecture.

Sir John Franklin. By A. H. Beesly. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1881. Sm. 8vo, pp. 238, with three maps. [New Plutarch Series.]

THE "New Plutarch" includes among its hero-types one which to the old Plutarch was unknown. That species of heroism which impels its possessor to visit sterile and inhospitable climes, to endure hardship and privation without murmuring, and, once escaped thence, to volunteer again—all in order that the sum of human knowledge may be slightly increased without benefit to the explorer—such heroism is the product of the higher civilization. No one more worthy to typify it could have been chosen than the subject of this memoir. The literary work has been neatly done. The language is clear and sufficiently sympathetic without gushing; the compiler seems to know the art of letting a story tell itself. A trained hand is shown in small details: thus, it is pleasant to see the name of Bering spelled as Bering was wont to spell it. We have noticed no errors in names; there are not too many references to authorities, and the writer does not linger long in theorizing over uncertain matters, such as the secrets of that last

fatal march of Crozier's party. There is a good index, the maps are fair, and the only serious omission we note is the absence of a portrait.

Few, indeed, have not some idea of Franklin's Arctic services, of his terrible journey on the Coppermine River, and of his last voyage, his death, and the melancholy fate of his associates. But even among those who have a good knowledge of his Arctic work we think there are many who will be surprised to be reminded that his first explorations were on the coast of Australia, that he fought with Nelson at Trafalgar, and was wounded at the attack on New Orleans, where he earned his promotion to a first lieutenant. Perhaps few will remember that in the interval between his second and his last expeditions he was the choice of Arnold of Rugby for the Governorship of Van Diemen's Land, then a penal colony. This post was accepted by Franklin in 1836, and its difficult duties were performed with sagacity and zeal. So far in advance of his time were his reforms that the gradually enlarging number of his opponents came, at last, to include his official superiors, and the opposition culminated in his recall in 1844. During these years his services, together with those of his devoted wife, had been inestimable to the people and institutions of the colony. Besides social and legal reforms, many of which ripened only after his departure, he instituted an unsectarian college, a scientific society, a museum of natural history, and a magnetic observatory. On his departure he walked to the pier attended by an immense assembly, at whose head were the Bishop of Tasmania and the new Colonial Secretary, and which included representatives from every part of the island. These joined in blessings and acclamations. Nine years afterwards the Tasmanians showed that time had not weakened their sense of his worth by sending as their contribution to the search fund of Lady Franklin the sum of £1,700.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Flower, Prof. W. H. Fashion in Deformity. New York: Macmillan & Co. 75 cents.
Fragoletta: a Tale. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. \$1.25.
Franklin, Rev. B. The Creed and Modern Thought. New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co.
Gibson, W. H. Camp Life in the Woods. New York: Harper & Bros.
Johnston, H. P. The Yorktown Campaign. New York: Harper & Bros.
Keeler, B. C. Short History of the Bible. Chicago: Century Publishing Co.
Lasar, S. English Anthems. New York: Biglow & Main.
Martin, Prof. H. N., and Moale, Dr. W. A. Handbook of Vertebrate Dissection. Part I. New York: Macmillan & Co. 75 cents.
Mémoires inédits de Lamartine. New York: P. W. Christern.

A BEAUTIFUL GIFT-BOOK. *Our Familiar Songs,* AND THOSE WHO MADE THEM.

More than Three Hundred Standard Songs of the English-speaking Race, arranged with Piano Accompaniment, and preceded by Sketches of the Writers and Histories of the Songs. By Helen Kendrick Johnson. 8vo, \$6.

"In all respects of size, elegance, copiousness, and curious detail, presents almost as much of a contrast to an ordinary song-book, however good, as a centennial exhibition to an old-fashioned country fair. . . . We have turned the pages of this unique and beautiful volume with delight. . . . Here is a library of the best music for the household. We may return to it again for some of its extremely interesting personal and literary particulars."—LITERARY WORLD.

HENRY HOLT & CO., New York.

The Wandering Jew.

An account of the Legend in various places and at all times. By Moncure D. Conway. 12mo, \$1.50.

"The legend . . . is the expression of that undying popular hatred of the Jewish race which found vent in the terrible persecutions of the Middle Ages, and which is again showing itself in the Judenhetze which disgraces modern Germany. . . . Mr. Moncure D. Conway, a writer who has earned for himself the right to speak for an expert on questions of folk-lore and demonology, . . . deserves our gratitude for having given a graphic and exhaustive account of this ancient and most curious myth."—LONDON SATURDAY REVIEW.

HENRY HOLT & CO., New York.

Putzger's One Dollar Atlas

Of Ancient, Mediæval, and Modern History. 76 maps, etc., in colors. Leipzig, 1881.

L. B. THOMAS,
409 W. Twentieth Street, New York.

Cheap Clearance Catalogue of Theological Text-Books and Rare Divinity just issued.

The Portable Bookcase manufactured solely by Lockwood, Brooks & Co., 381 Washington Street, Boston, Mass., is the most perfect thing of the kind, it being easily moved, and adjustable for books of all sizes. Send for circular or call and see it.

UNMOUNTED PHOTOGRAPHS

OF ANCIENT and MODERN WORKS of ART, embracing reproductions of famous original paintings, sculpture, architectural subjects, etc. Price, cabinet size, \$1.50 per doz. Send stamp for catalogue of 1,600 subjects. JOHN P. SOULE, Publisher, 338 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

THE HYGEIA HOTEL, Old Point Comfort, Va., situated 100 yards from Fort Monroe. Open all the year. Equal to any hotel in the United States as a Summer Resort or Cold Weather Sanitarium. Send for circular describing hygienic advantages, etc.

